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ABSTRACT

THE IMPACT OF THE 101s: A GUIDE TO POSITIVE DISCIPLINE TRAINING ON TEACHER INTERACTION PRACTICES, ATTITUDES, AND PROSOCIAL SKILL OUTCOMES IN PRESCHOOL CLASSROOMS

Marie L. Masterson
Old Dominion University, 2008
Chairperson: Dr. Katharine C. Kersey

This study investigated the impact of The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline on teachers of preschool Title 1 children. Current research supports the impact of responsive social emotional support and positive teacher-child interactions on both short and long term social and academic outcomes, with specific remediating benefits for children most at risk of school failure. The 101s training and materials evaluated in this study included ten principles/skills to support respectful, responsive interactions hypothesized to support positive prosocial skill responding. Training was provided to 34 teachers with control and experimental groups. Analysis of quantitative pre and post observation data found statistically significant increases in teacher interaction quality as measured by the 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist on variables of positive redirection of behavior and responsive social emotional support as well as significant increase in overall classroom quality. The 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist outcomes were highly positively correlated with CLASS scores in dimensions of positive climate, teacher sensitivity, regard for student perspectives and behavior management.

The 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist scores for responsive social emotional support and positive behavior redirection were highly positively correlated with children’s prosocial skills, including self-control, compliance, emotional regulation, attention, helping, asking, sharing, and cooperation. Since prosocial skills are known to
increase both short and long term academic achievement and school adjustment, the current study provides new evidence for a specific training program that links positive changes in teacher behavior to resulting higher overall classroom interaction quality and resulting prosocial outcomes for children.

The study revealed teacher perceptions and attitudes that may be potential barriers to increasing positive, responsive interactions, including beliefs about control and compliance. After 101s training, teachers indicated that acquisition of new skills along with observed changes in child behavior outcomes impacted their willingness to use positive/responsive interaction approaches. Training in The 101s significantly increased scores on a measure of interaction quality assessment used by the state preschool rating and improvement system, suggesting The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline to be a valuable training component to increase the teacher-child interaction quality of preschool classrooms.
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While state guidelines require teachers of young children to use positive classroom management techniques and responsive social/emotional support in the classroom, there is a lack of research evidence to show what kind of training will best facilitate teacher use of these strategies. The current study will evaluate a specific training model, *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline (The 101s)* (Kersey, 2006), in Title 1 urban preschool classrooms. The introductory chapter will describe the problem, explain the significance, and articulate the purpose of the study. Next, the background for *The 101s* training model will be presented. Finally, the research questions will be introduced, limitations discussed, and definitions of relevant terms provided.

The literature review, presented in Chapter II, will synthesize evidence that supports the need for development and evaluation of teacher training models that specifically target teacher-child interactions in preschool classrooms. The research hypotheses will be presented and the theoretical underpinnings for the model will be introduced. The literature review will address the quality and nature of teacher-child interactions, the critical importance of prosocial skill development, and the socio-cultural factors that impact teacher practices.

The methodology section in Chapter III will outline the research variables, describes the population for the current study, and introduce procedures, methods of implementation and assessment instruments. The results section in Chapter IV, will present the outcomes of analysis performed that address the research questions of this
study. Chapter V will summarize the findings, describe research implications, and submit recommendations for future research.

Background of the Study

*The critical years of early childhood and the need for teacher training.* The social and emotional needs of young children present a unique challenge to educational policy and practice (Ahnert, Pinquart, & Lamb, 2006). The concentrated attention on early childhood education is fueled by an unprecedented demand for childcare services and overwhelming new interdisciplinary research that links strong social emotional support in preschool to long term academic and social benefits for children (Shonkoff, 2001). With the spotlight on four-year old universal preschool, the focus has turned to the overall benefits of emotional competence, the link between emotional support and academic outcomes, and the mediating impact of early emotional/social support for children at risk. Within this context, the need for specialized training for teachers of young children is imperative.

The years between birth and five are a critical period of development, which will set the long-term trajectory towards success or failure in school (Hamre & Pianta, 2001; The Cost, Quality and Child Care Outcomes Study Team, 1995; National Center for Early Development and Learning, 1999; Thompson, 2001). The research evidence presents a complicated mandate to educators and policy makers to adequately balance support for academic achievement with developmentally appropriate approaches. The challenge for those involved in early childhood education is to address the demand for quality care with policy and practice that will also support young children’s social and emotional needs (Magnuson, Reynolds, & Ou, 2006).
The movement towards early preparation and intervention for preschool children is greatly influenced by the impact of The No Child Left Behind Act on educational policy (Stipek, 2006). Resulting high stakes academic testing in elementary school has put pressure on preschools to prepare unprecedented numbers of children with “readiness” skills prior to kindergarten (Thompson, 2004). While most early learning guidelines incorporate social/emotional childcare standards (National Infant and Toddler Child Care Initiative and National Child Care Information Center, 2006), a significant gap between research and practice still remains (O’Connor & McCartney, 2006).

More advanced training for teachers tends to result in overall higher language support and greater child outcomes, however increased teacher training or level of education are not a guarantee of quality teacher-child interactions (Early et al., 2007; LoCasale-Crouch et al., 2007; Pianta, 2003a). While studies link the education level of the teacher with the overall environmental quality of a preschool classroom, the quality of teacher-child interaction varies (Pianta, 2003b; Schultz, 2008). Since young children’s daily psychological experiences and healthy developmental outcomes are dependent on the quality and nature of these interactions, there is a critical need for caregiver training that focuses on responsive, positive teacher-child interactions (Virginia QRIS, 2008).

Currently 49 states have early learning guidelines for childcare and state funded preschools (Schultz, 2008). These include benchmark standards for effective practice that have primarily focused on academic content (National Infant and Toddler Child Care Initiative and National Child Care Information Center, 2006). Nevertheless, obstacles hinder the translation of these standards into practice. Training, assessment, accountability and policy vary widely due to the variety of funding sources that may
include Title 1, Head Start, early childhood special education, private, local, or state funds (Barnett, 2008; Huston, 2008; Schultz, 2008). With the unprecedented shift of childcare services into school-based environments, educators and policy makers are working to develop accountability, consistency, and alignment across the system.

The U.S. Department of Education indicates that 2/3 of all three to five year olds in the United States attend childcare or preschool 40 hours a week or more (NICHD Early Child Care Research Network, 2005). In Hampton Roads, Virginia, the setting of the current study, and in other areas with high concentrations of military service personnel, children may spend 60 or more hours a week in childcare (Lucas, 2001). National reports show that 72% of working mothers have children under the age of five in the care of someone besides a parent. Of these childcare service arrangements, 48% are placed with relatives, 31% at profit or non-profit childcare centers, and 21% with other providers (United States Department of Labor, 2001; U.S. Department of Labor, 2008). Other figures show that up to 60% of four year olds are already in some type of care (Magnuson & Waldfogel, 2004). Of the 11 million three year olds, five million will spend at least 25 hours a week in the care of someone other than a parent (Ehrle, Adams & Tout, 2001). Nationally, over one million three and four year olds attend state-funded preschools (Barnett, Hustedt, Friedman, Boyd, & Ainsworth, 2007). These statistics illustrate the magnitude of need for quality early experiences for children prior to kindergarten.

Retention rates, in addition to attendance statistics, impact the priority status of early childhood education. According to Virginia Governor's Strong Start Council (2008), nearly 10,000 children in Virginia repeated a year of school from kindergarten
through third grade. Of those, 1,000 were retained in kindergarten. By 2012, the goal of the Virginia Strong Start Council is to support a statewide early childhood network that will serve 67% of four year olds in the state through the Virginia Preschool Initiative (Kaine, 2008). High retention rates along with the need for expanded childcare services indicate a strong need for enhanced training for early education teachers (Virginia Strong Start Council, 2008).

As part of the Early Childhood Alignment Project, the Commonwealth of Virginia has committed to a voluntary Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS) that focuses on five performance standards. The Governor’s Council has mandated a coordinated system of professional development and requested funding to support a mentoring program to help teachers meet these accountability standards (Virginia Start Strong Council Final Report, August, 2008). Of note is the requirement for research-based strategies that will increase the quality of classroom [teacher-child] interactions. The mentoring component of the QRIS will include a focus on improvement in teacher-child interaction quality (Governor’s Working Group, 2008). The Governor is encouraging enhanced early childhood education programs to train teachers for the expanded programs.

The newly established “Add-On” Early Childhood Endorsement in the Commonwealth of Virginia has also added social emotional support skills to teacher competencies (Virginia Department of Education, 2007). In addition, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) licensing standards recently included a stronger emphasis on teacher support of children’s social and emotional development.
State licensing competencies for teachers and childcare centers also have been updated to include a stronger focus on teacher training to support children's social and emotional needs (NAEYC-NCATE, 2007a, 2007b). All of these policy requirements call for the development of research-based models for teacher training that will address preschool children's social-emotional needs.

Some current studies show that up to 90% of classroom time and up to 100% of kindergarten classroom time is spent in whole group activities (Pianta, 2003) yet it is unclear how teacher interactions meet the emotional and attachment needs of young children within a group context (Rolfe, 2004). The literature suggests the remedial, compensatory, and predictive nature of social emotional support as leading to direct and indirect effects on prosocial skill development and academic outcomes both in the short term and over time (Schultz, 2008; Shonkoff & Philips, 2001). Given the long hours young children spend in preschool contexts, it is particularly imperative to support teachers in the use of high quality, responsive interactions.

In a Meta-Analysis of childcare programs (Ahnert et al., 2006), researchers examined the impact of emotional sensitivity and security of children's relationships with their caregivers and confirmed the link between more sensitive practices and greater positive prosocial outcomes. This large body of evidence revealed a strong relationship between the frequency of caregivers' emotional availability, sensitivity, and reciprocal responsiveness on overall developmental, educational and prosocial outcomes. Further research was recommended to explore the impact of specific strategies of teacher practice on prosocial outcomes for preschool children.
Most of these previous studies have investigated social and emotional factors in the context of academic outcomes, or in correlational and longitudinal studies that link positive, warm teacher interactions with achievement outcomes (Ahnert et al., 2006). While research studies show the beneficial outcomes of responsive, sensitive interaction techniques when those strategies are already present in the preschool classroom (NASBE, 2006), they do not detail how those interactions should best be taught or supported in teacher training or professional development programs. By focusing on the types of interactions that promote the development of prosocial skills, the current study will target teacher behaviors that are independent of curriculum and cut across all pedagogical domains in the classroom. *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* training model will address the recommendations and guidelines of national early childhood professional organizations, and will be substantiated by a clear theoretical and research-based foundation that includes positive, respectful teacher-child interactions known to result in healthy relationships and school success.

*The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline training model.* Based in decades of research promoting positive reinforcement and limiting punitive methods known to decrease motivation, the principles and strategies of *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* are supported by 30 years of testing in the Child Study Center laboratory school at Old Dominion University. The award winning 101s training model serves as the foundation of the early childhood teacher, parent education programs and preschool classrooms at Old Dominion University, a nationally recognized program for effective early childhood teacher training.
The current study draws on an additional research collaboration that provided professional development for licensed childcare providers. Data from the Directors Institute, a research partnership between Old Dominion University and licensed childcare centers, revealed changes in underlying attitudes about teacher-child interactions and greater understanding of the need for positive, responsive interaction practices in center classrooms. The Child Study Center, Director’s Institute, and Early Childhood Education practicum programs, under the direction of Dr. Katharine Kersey, are known for their excellence and exemplary approach to preschool education (SACS-CASI Report, 2007).

The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) has called for training to support a learning environment characterized by positive, supportive parent and teacher-child relationships; a strategy for systematic teaching and strengthening of desired behaviors; and a strategy for decreasing ineffective behaviors (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2005). The strategies provided by The 101s are recommended for use by the American Academy of Pediatrics in their SCAN Newsletter (2005). The techniques of The 101s also meet the recommendations of NAEYC’s Code of Ethical Conduct (NAEYC, 2005) and standards of professional practice in early childhood programs. The teaching model supports NAEYC Standard 1: Relationships: The model “promotes positive relationships among all children and adults to encourage each child’s sense of individual worth and belonging as part of a community and to foster each child’s ability to contribute as a responsible community member” (NAEYC, 2008).

The techniques, skills, and strategies of The 101s are supported individually and collectively by well-established theoretical, educational, psychological, medical, and social research evidence that substantiates the benefit of responsive, positive relationships
in the preschool environment, with particular efficacy to children at risk. The National Association of School Psychologists [NASP] (2006) has supported the immediate need to develop young children’s relational competencies through “evidence-based socio-emotional curricula and professional development efforts that enhance the quality of teacher-child relationships and interactions” (NASP Practice and Policy Connections, 2006, pp. 2). The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the National State Boards of Education are recommending research to investigate effective teacher training models, which will increase the quality of teacher-child interactions, particularly in the area of social-emotional support.

The 101s training model includes filmed classroom examples of each principle being used with preschool children in the Child Study Center and in Title 1 classrooms. The principles are communicated in “easy to use” language and are simple to read, view, and follow. This practical application and exposure to effective models adds an important component to the research, especially given the fact that in Hampton Roads, VA, 62% of childcare providers and 70% of home providers have no more than a high school degree. According to statistics gathered by The Planning Council and United Way South Hampton Roads (Schwab, Derrick, & Russel, 2006), less than one fifth of center directors, center-based teachers and all home providers have a minimum of a Child Development Association (CDA) certificate and only 24% of all licensed center directors have a college degree in Early Childhood Education. The need for training is overwhelming, with 5,780 licensed centers in Virginia, including over 500 directors, 682 licensed home care providers, and 4,652 preschool teachers. It is imperative that an effective training method is easy to understand and use; provide effective, real-life
modeling; is readily implemented; and is applicable to all preschool teachers with low or no cost.

The strategies of *The 101s* are useful across settings, addressing relationship and learning outcomes during and outside of instructional time. As implementation does not rely on the use of a specific curriculum, the training model supports teachers across all preschool environments. The singular focus on teacher-child interactions makes the strategies equally valuable in all school settings such as the lunchroom, bathroom, and transitions, which are notorious for being a time when teachers struggle for control and need consistency in effective behavior management.

*Operational definitions for teacher-child interactions.* For the current study, teacher interactions focus on two areas: positive redirection skills and responsive social-emotional support. Both are important in the formative preschool environment, as teachers report dealing with behavior problems as their most difficult challenge (Jalongo, 2006). Teachers themselves are often uncertain how to proactively and successfully redirect behavior. Pianta states, “If a teacher cannot effectively manage children’s behavior, she is likely to spend a disproportionate amount of time addressing misbehavior, thereby limiting her opportunities to teach” (Pianta & Hadden, 2008, pp. 21). *The 101s* provides proactive techniques that form and reinforce prosocial behaviors within the context of respectful relationships.

For the current study, positive redirection skills are operationally defined as strategies that support positive child behavior outcomes. These include *Make a Big Deal Principle* which provides praise and positive support in the context of a responsive relationship (Huebner & Gilman, 2003; Miller & Sawka-Miller, 2007; Stipek, 1997;
Solnick, Rincover, & Peterson, 1977); \textit{Incompatible Alternative-Choice Principle} which introduces an incompatible alternative or choice that is specific and productive (Burgess, Wojslawowicz, Rubin, Rose-Krasnor, & Booth-Laforce, 2006; Skinner, 1968, in Gredler, 2005; Sroufe, 1983; Tiger, Hanley & Hernandez, 2006); \textit{Talk About Them Positively to Others Principle} which gives specific affirming verbal reinforcement and affirmation in the presence of others (Bandura, 1977; Crosnoe, Johnson, & Elder, 2004; Hamre & Pianta, 2005; Hart & Risley, 1995; Landry, 2005; Landry, Smith, Swank, Assel & Vellet, 2001; Perry, 2001); \textit{Extinction Principle} which ignores minor misbehavior such as age-appropriate wiggling or movement (Davies, McMahon, Flessati, & Tiedemann, 1984; Krumboltz and Krumboltz, 1972); \textit{When-Then Principle} which diffuses power struggles by offering positive contingencies based on cooperation, such as, “When you finish putting away blocks, then you may take out a puzzle” (Dreikurs & Grey, 1968/1993; Dreikurs, 1968; Dreikurs, Grunwald, & Pepper, 1982); and \textit{Whisper Principle}, in which a teacher lowers voice volume to get attention and responds calmly rather than using punitive or stressful actions and words (Shonkoff, 2005; Adler & Stein, 2005).

Operational definitions for the teacher-child interaction skill of responsive social-emotional support include \textit{Validation Principle} in which the teacher validates a child’s feeling by naming the emotion (Ackerman & Youngstrom, 2001: Raikes & Thompson, 2006); \textit{Connection Principle} which affirms a child by creating personal relational conversation (Bennet, Elliott & Peters, 2005; Cicchetti, Toth & Hennessey, 1989; Kestenbaum, Farber & Sroufe, 1989; Pianta & Walsh, 1996; NICHD ECCRN, 2005); \textit{Respect Principle} in which a teacher responds respectfully to a child’s initiation (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005; Spencer, Jordan, & Sazama, 2004; Hart, Atkins, & Fegley,
Get on the Child’s Eye Level Principle in which the teacher gets down on child’s eye level to respond or speak (Hornik, Risenhoover, & Gunnar, 1987; Sorce, Ernde, Campos, & Klinnert, 1985; Walden, & Ogan, 1988); and Time In Principle (Baker, 1999; Goodenow, 1993; Ireson & Hallam, 2005; Wentzel, 1999), which provides a child with physical affirmation and direct focus important to close relationship with young children (Ahnert et al., 2006; Bennett et al., 2005; NICHD ECCRN, 2005). Other strategies for responsive interaction include Modeling Principle in which the teacher shows how to behave by direct example (Bandura, 1991; Bennett et al., 2005; Davidov & Crusec, 2006; Denham, 2005; Eisenberg et al., 2005; Isley, O’Neil, & Park, 1996; O’Conner & McCartney, 2006); and Belonging and Significance Principle which assigns responsibility to a child (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989; Berg, 2000; Maslow, 1973; Weiner, 1979). These strategies are hypothesized to support the dimensions of teacher-child interaction for this study, which include positive redirection skills and responsive social-emotional support.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the current study is to implement The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline as part of normally scheduled professional development for Title 1 preschool teachers in an urban school district. The training will be evaluated to examine changes in teachers’ behavior redirection skills and interaction practices, and to measure the impact of training on classroom interaction quality. The study will provide a critical missing link in the academic literature and in professional development training, as it seeks to assess an effective method to increase the quality of teacher-child interactions in preschool classrooms.
Research Questions

The current study will focus on three questions:

Does training in positive interaction techniques through *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* impact measures of preschool teacher interaction quality including change in positive redirection of behavior and responsive social emotional-support, and will *The 101s* training affect measures of overall classroom interaction quality?

Does the use of *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* positive interaction techniques (positive redirection of behavior and responsive social-emotional support) impact measures of children’s prosocial outcomes?

Does training in *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* impact teachers’ attitudes towards strategy support for children’s behavior?

Research Hypotheses and Variables

There are three research hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: a) Teachers who have been trained in the positive interaction techniques of *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* will have higher teacher interaction checklist scores for positive redirection of behavior skills and responsive social emotional-support, and higher Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) observation scores (Pianta, LaParo, & Hamre, 2008) than the control group as measures of teacher interaction quality; and b) teacher interaction checklist scores will be correlated with CLASS observation scores.

Hypothesis 2: Children in the experimental group whose teachers attended *The 101s* training will have higher prosocial skill scores than children in the control group
whose teachers did not attend *The 101s* training; and b) teacher interaction checklist scores and children’s prosocial checklist scores will be correlated.

**Hypothesis 3:** Training in *The 101s* will positively impact teachers’ attitudes towards strategy support for children’s behaviors. The hypothesized outcome, based on previous theoretical and research foundations, is that *The 101s* training will increase teacher use of positive redirection skills and responsive social-emotional support, and will increase overall classroom quality and child prosocial behaviors.

The variables for hypothesis 1 include the impact of one independent variable (teacher training or no teacher training) on measures of two dependent variables (positive redirection of behavior and responsive social-emotional support). *The 101s Teacher Behavior Checklists* will be used to measure change in the dependent variables of positive redirection of behavior skills and responsive social-emotional support. Overall classroom teacher-child interaction quality will be measured using the CLASS observation system to examine changes in positive climate, negative climate, teacher sensitivity, regard for student perspectives, and classroom management. The variables for hypothesis 2 include the impact of two independent variables (teacher positive redirection of behavior skills and responsive social-emotional support.) on the dependent variable for child prosocial skills, as assessed by *The 101s Child Behavior Checklist* for emotional regulation, self control, attention, compliance, helping, asking, sharing, and cooperating. The variables for hypothesis 3 include the independent variable (the impact of *The 101s* training) on the dependent variable, change in teacher attitude, as measured by *The 101s Teacher Attitude Questionnaire*, document review, and detailed observation notes.
Limitations

This section describes several limitations of the study. The quasi-experimental research design utilized teachers and classrooms from a convenience sample that included the entire district population of 35 urban schools containing 110 Title 1 preschool classrooms. In the design model, unexpected extemporaneous variables such as environmental and social factors, economic status, race, physical and ecological issues, classroom quality, teacher quality and previous training may impact results interactively or separately. While true random selection was not possible, this limitation was addressed by random assignment of schools and teachers to control and experimental groups in a pre- and post-test design in order to provide maximum control of variables and to assure that participants represented statistically similar representative populations. Similarly, assignment of teachers to order of observation and researcher assessment was determined by random assignment.

Researcher bias could present a threat to internal validity. To address this limitation, variables were controlled through double blind assignment. Neither the raters nor the participants knew who belonged to the control or experimental group. The raters did not participate in or observe experimental group training, nor were any of the three raters aware of which teachers had been assigned to control or experimental groups. Only after the data was recorded was the researcher informed of group assignment. Group information was kept confidential by a third party until after the study was concluded. Therefore, post-assessment changes between the control group and The 101s training group statistically represented the impact of the intervention while minimizing internal validity concerns.
The mixed method design provided additional qualitative data to substantiate relevant quantitative data, thus increasing internal validity. To obtain qualitative data, questionnaires were created based on strong theoretical and research support, and were triangulated by document review of training manual assignments. Detailed researcher observation notes provided further evidence to support the findings of the study. To protect the experimental nature of the study, questionnaires were not returned to the researcher until quantitative data had been recorded.

Because the study was confined to a one-semester public school calendar, the number of teachers involved in this phase of research was limited. Additionally, the nature of preschool activities included recess, naptime, special events and other unpredictable scheduling interruptions such as testing and holidays, which extended the total length of time needed to complete observations. Therefore, while the observational assessments required approximately two to three hours per classroom for both pre- and post-intervention measures, those hours were dispersed over the length of the school day. Given the time restraints of the first phase, the study will be extended in the future to increase the total number of classroom and teacher participants, therefore increasing the power of the statistical results.

To ensure that ethical guidelines were followed, teachers received informed consent documents (Appendix A) and were given the option not to participate in the study. All teachers understood that they would receive training regardless of their placement in control or experimental group assignment, therefore no particular incentive to participate was provided. The training was offered as part of the regular professional development program of the district, further removing any “special” status of
participation, thereby minimizing the Hawthorne effect. Data was reported in aggregate and not linked to individual teachers to protect confidentiality. Human subjects’ exempt approval was obtained and all data linking responses to participants were kept locked with the provision that they would be destroyed after the conclusion of the study.

While the results of the study may not be generalizable to all other preschool populations, the urban setting of this school district makes it an excellent representative sample of similar urban districts and Title 1 programs in the country. Given the extent of literature on the remedial nature of responsive teacher-child interactions for preschool children at risk of school failure, this study represents a critical population. For example, the district utilized in this study had promotion rates slightly lower than the state. Proficiency in state standards tests in English and math were lower than the state average. Poverty rates for the district were twice as high as statewide averages, as was child abuse and juvenile crime. Over 60% of students were approved for free or reduced lunch, twice the state average, and 69% of the district’s four year olds and 89% of three year olds were African American (District Pre-K Evaluation, 2004). Given these population descriptions, the results of the current study would be generalizable to similar urban settings serving children at risk.

Significance and Applicability of the Study

The importance of social-emotional support for preschool children is a priority for those who work on behalf of young children. With nearly 30% of children entering kindergarten lacking the necessary prosocial skills to be successful in school (Boyd et al., 2003), providing effective educational training and support for early childhood teachers is imperative. While The 101s have been used successfully in the preschool environment in
the context of the Child Study Center at Old Dominion University (ODU), public and private elementary and preschools (CDC Handbook, 2006), and have been used to train counselors, educators and parents in a variety of environments, quantitative evaluation of the training model in a public school setting has not yet been provided. The current study will evaluate the impact of the model on the attitudes and practices of teachers in preschool classrooms. The current study will evaluate a model that would meet the need for “to scale” training within a variety of contexts, including public, private, and licensed childcare centers.

Overview of Literature Review

The literature review will be organized by the research questions and will focus on the quality and nature of adult-child interactions as they impact children’s social-emotional development. A theoretical framework for responsive social-emotional practices will be provided. The impact of adult-child interactions on educational outcomes and prosocial behavior development will be discussed. The review will synthesize the contributions from experimental and qualitative studies that highlight the need for the current study.

Strategies for locating supportive literature included database searches for peer reviewed and professional journals and early childhood research foundations. Professional organizations, policy initiative reports, federal and state government websites and other early childhood educational resources were utilized to provide supportive statistics and an overview of educational and policy issues that contribute to the context of the study. University research departments were consulted for supportive articles as well as government and educational sites that list current research in early
childhood. The literature review will give a comprehensive framework for establishing positive, responsive teacher-child interactions within preschool environments.
Literature Review

The literature review is organized into the following sections. First, a theoretical framework for responsive teacher-child interactions is described. A review of evidence that supports the critical influence of quality teacher interactions on developmental and academic outcomes, outcomes for children at risk, prosocial skills, and children's behavior is provided. The relevance of teachers' attitudes and beliefs is addressed. Next, the recommendations for development of teacher training models are substantiated. Finally, models of change that support *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* training are articulated. Emphasis is given to the types of reciprocal interactions that impact children's outcomes within the social-emotional environment of the preschool classroom.

*Theoretical Frameworks*

The framework of attachment theory provides scaffolding for the social-emotional foundations of children in early childhood (Rolfe, 2004). A secure attachment with caregivers is considered an important protective factor in resilience regardless of risk factors (Howes & Hamilton 1992; Sroufe, 1995). The elements of a warm, caring relationship allow a child to internalize self-control and increase cognitive development (Kestenbaum et al., 1989). What children experience as a result of close attachment with adults shapes their attitudes about life, about others, and about themselves (Raver, 2002).

A significant body of research supports the impact of early attachment relationships. Bowlby (1969) and Ainsworth (1982) proposed that the emotional attachments formed between children and caregivers created the socio-emotional patterns that inform future relationships. Howes and Hamilton (1992) found that children who experienced secure attachment relationships with their caregivers had more positive
relationships and showed higher prosocial skills with their peers, and these effects lasted over time. In contrast, for very young children (Vandell & Corasanti, 1990), the longer they were found to have received non-parental care as infants, the more difficulty they experienced in subsequent academic achievement, peer relationships, and emotional health. Attachment theory provides an important foundation for the relational dynamics involved in children's social-emotional development.

A second explanation for the influence of early relationships is provided through the Relational-Cultural Theory (Spencer et al., 2004). Because significant relationships create emotional patterns for self-appraisal as well as interaction with others, adult-child interactions create a lasting blueprint for future relationships. Early connections are supported through “growth fostering relationships” where reciprocal empathy is central. Core components of this approach include mutual respect as well as responsive listening and interacting. The authentic inter-relationship provides a secure base for a child’s healthy psychological growth. The supportive emotional interactions empower a sense of relational competence for the child.

Within the Relational-Cultural theory, interactions are guided by respect rather than by power and coercion (West, 2005). The Relational-Cultural theory proposes that maturity develops through intimacy and connection, and an emphasis is placed on the purposeful awareness of the impact of one’s words, emotions, and actions on others. The responsive interactions described through this theory are essential to the approach of the current study.

The Relational-Cultural model has strong ties with the work of Alfred Adler. Similarities include mutual respect based on equality and a fundamental faith in the child.
An important assumption of Adler’s theory is that the more human beings develop, the more they connect to others (Adler & Stein 2005). The mutual empathy and relationship that are established between adult and child build trust and cooperation without the need for coercion or punishment. The work of Adler establishes a child’s need for authentic relationships with significant adults that nurture the growth of relational skills and life competencies. The child’s basic need for belonging and significance within the context of a caring community is foundational to the philosophy of *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline*.

These theoretical models of intentional support and empowerment for emotional competence are congruent with the research evidence of Denham (2005) and Pianta, Hamre & Stuhlman (2003) who suggest that warm, positive relationships support factors of resilience, and include many variables necessary for healthy social, emotional, and academic adjustment. Thijs, Koomen & van der Leigh (2008) investigated the teacher-child relationship, particularly the important role of caregivers in providing a secure base and supportive interactions. The researchers cited three important studies that indicate that the quality of the relationship is positively associated with emotional support, positive interactions, and positive climate, as well as quality instructional practices.

With the extended hours children spend under the guidance and nurturance of non-parental caregivers, warm, sensitive emotional interactions take on particular importance. The conceptual frameworks of attachment theory and Relational-Cultural theory provide a theoretical pathway between the quality and nature of adult-child interactions and resulting social-emotional growth in children. Taken together, these theoretical underpinnings, supported by substantial research, illustrate the critical
dependence of children on their interactions with adults, which yield a strong and lasting impact on social and learning outcomes for children.

*The Importance of Teacher-Child Interactions*

The *impact and nature of teacher-child interaction on developmental and academic outcomes*. Children's relationships are defined and guided by the emotional, intellectual, and psychological transactions they experience with adults. The way adults respond to children becomes a foundation for the perceptions children form of themselves and others (Koplow, 2002). While these relational influences are supported by psychological research (Bowlby, 1988) and the patterns of adult-child attachment have consistently been shown to impact healthy human development, current evidence from neuroscience provides an explanation. Attachment theory provides a framework for understanding the unique, substantiated interdependence of relationships, while neuroscience provides evidence explaining how and why early experiences can either empower future healthy relationships or cause devastation to life relational patterns. Neuroscience evidence shows that the brain itself develops neuropathways formed through early experiences that shape children's biochemical, psychological, endocrine, and autoimmune responses for the rest of life. Early experiences of stress and levels of low emotional connection create detrimental outcomes for a child's ability to be resilient, self-regulated, and adaptive (Siegel, 1999, 2003). In addition to creating relational patterns for the future, adult responsiveness, reciprocal language interactions, emotional connection and attachment issues impact young children's future social engagement, emotional regulation, symbolic thinking, verbal IQ and emotional competence (Cozolino, 2006). It is imperative that researchers, parents, and educators consider this evidence,
given the increasing numbers of children who spend a majority of time with caregivers, as early relational adult-child interactions impact children’s ability to function socially and to succeed in school.

These influential adult-child interactions are referred to as reciprocal, responsive interactions by Ackerman and Youngstrom (2001), and are particularly critical for preschool children. Children are unable to demonstrate healthy ways of resolving conflict unless adults model the techniques themselves, provide accurate feedback and validation for their experiences, and teach skills to negotiate the social landscape of interpersonal transactions (Denham, 2005). The dependency of the child on the caregiver to provide positive, responsive interactions is the hallmark of a quality preschool environment (Haynes, 2008; Raver et al., 2008). The nature of these interactions defines the daily experiences of young children.

Just as competency in social skills insures children’s success in forming healthy relationships, academic skills, as well, are best supported through genuine, sensitive, caring relationships and responsive teacher-child interactions (Kontos, & Wilcox-Herzog, 1997; Philips & Adams, 2001). The National Center for Education Statistics Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, The Cost Quality, and Outcomes Study, and Abecedarian Study are a few of the major government funded longitudinal investigations that have provided data linking the quality of teacher-child interactions to ongoing academic and social success for children (NICHD, 2005). With this association well established, educators, researchers and policy makers have focused new energy, resources and priority on initiatives to increase the quality of teacher interaction practices.
Several researchers suggested a model to provide effective implementation of positive, responsive emotional support both to children in childcare settings and to family members at home (Burchinal, Campbell, Bryant, Wasic & Ramey, 1997; Steelman, Assel, Swank, Smith, & Landry, 2002). The authors described cognitive performance over time as dependent on the quality of caregiving that is provided, mediated by infant responsiveness. Two sources were identified; home care treatment and child care treatment intervention that indirectly influenced children’s IQ outcomes. The childcare intervention included attendance six to eight hours a day, in-service training for staff members, and a quality, intellectually stimulating environment. The results from this study suggested that cognitive performance for African American children was enhanced by the high quality of the intervention factors. Recommendations were given for research-based, high quality early intervention programs that would train adult caregivers to provide responsive social-emotional support for children.

Pianta and Hadden (2008) as well as others (Hall & Long Dilworth, 2005; Huston, 2008) delineate the interaction processes from the structural components of a preschool program such as curriculum or environmental features. In fact, adult-child interactions are found to be more significant to learning outcomes and prosocial skill development than choice of curriculum, physical environment, home risk factors, or previous exposure to strong literacy environments (Pianta, 2003a). Yet, in spite of what is known about the importance of teacher-child interactions, there is a lack of evidence that identifies specific teacher-training approaches that will significantly increase teacher interaction quality (Blau, 2000; Burchinal, Howes & Kontos, 2002; Howes, Phillips & Whitebrook 1992; Phillips, Mekos, Scarr, McCartney & Abbott-Shim, 2000; National...
Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Early Child Care Research Network (NICHD ECCRN), 2000). Even with this recommendation, Huston (2008) reports that level of teacher education in and of itself does not prepare someone to be an early childhood educator. Huston suggests that, “Although recent teacher training programs emphasize literacy activities and curriculum, many professionals believe that the quality of teacher-child relationships and classroom climate are central to both intellectual and social development” (Huston, 2008, pg. 9). There is abundant research to clearly indicate that increasing competencies in positive, effective interaction processes is particularly important for teachers of children at risk, in order for optimal outcomes to be attained.

The impact of teacher interactions on children at risk. In addition to supporting children’s academic outcomes, responsive, emotionally sensitive care has been shown to mediate the impact of stress, lack of maternal attachment, and other risk factors associated with children from lower socio-economic backgrounds (Burchinal et al., 1997). The elements of a warm, caring relationship allow a child to internalize self-control and increase cognitive development (Kestenbaum et al., 1989). For young children at risk, these relationships with teachers are particularly important, as early experiences characterized by low stress and positive climates actually shield children from stress and risk factors from home (O’Connor & McCartney, 2006).

For the 30% of children at risk prior to kindergarten, responsive social-emotional support mediates against all other risk factors and provides for increased development for children in every area (Hamre & Pianta, 2005; Silver, Measelle, Armstrong, & Essex, 2004). Children with risk factors (low social economic or minority status) who receive strong instructional and emotional support from teachers achieved academic outcomes
equal to students with no risk factors (Hamre & Pianta, 2005). The long-term benefits of positive, sensitive teacher-child interactions include improvements in academic and reading achievement, higher graduation rates, higher IQ, greater cognitive development, better outcomes for children with disabilities, and less referral to special education overall (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2001).

In spite of what is known about the benefits of responsive teacher-child interactions, children at risk are much less likely to attend high quality center-based preschools (NASBE, 2006) where such practices are more highly valued. Children at risk experience fewer positive, supportive affirmations at home (Hart & Risley, 1995; NICHD, 2005) and therefore benefit strongly from responsive teacher interactions in preschool. Yet students who most need strong positive support are more likely to experience negative or coercive practices at school (Renke & Herman, 2002). The stress of early punitive environments negatively impacts children’s physical and mental health, compromises children’s immune systems, increases behavior problems, and increases long-term incarceration and public assistance rates (Schonkoff, 2005).

Peisner-Feinberg & Burchinal (1997) in the Cost, Quality, and Outcomes Study, found that for children in preschool, the interaction and quality of the teacher-child relationship positively impacted cognitive skills as well as social skills, and that these effects were still seen in the second grade. The fact that emotional intervention at school was effective in spite of home or risk characteristics is of significance to educators. Other longitudinal studies have reported that the quality of strong, caring relationships between teachers and young children impacts future social and educational outcomes (Bennett et al., 2005). With the tremendous variation in classroom practices noted in
these studies, further research was suggested to better understand the attitudes that impact adult-child interactions and to be able to develop effective training strategies for educators to mediate home deficits.

The effect of emotional support in early childhood classrooms and impact of supportive teacher-child interactions was studied by Hamre and Pianta (2005). A group of 920 children at risk were examined for first grade developmental outcomes. Responsive social-emotional support by teachers was identified as a moderator of risk factors for children age five to six. After one year, children with risk factors (low social economic or minority status) who received strong instructional and emotional support from teachers, achieved academic outcomes equal to students with no risk factors. The researchers recommend providing teachers with professional development training based on empirical evidence, which would yield effective practices resulting in more positive prosocial outcomes for children.

The quality of relationship with preschool teachers strongly impacted a child's current and future social and academic success (Ahnert et al., 2006; Denham, 2005; Pintrich, 2000; Peisner-Feinberg, 2004; Raikes and Thompson, 2006; Raver, 2002; Rimm-Kaufman, La Paro, Downer, & Pianta, 2005; and Stipek, 1997). Sensitive, reciprocal interactions were linked to more positive social and cognitive outcomes, higher empathy and prosocial responding, and emotional self-regulation (Eisenberg, Zhou, Spinrad, Valiente, Fabes, & Liew, 2005). This body of research highlights the importance of developing training models for preschool teachers so that they understand the critical nature of adult interaction choices on children's current and future outcomes.
The impact of teacher interactions on prosocial skill development. It is the quality of sensitive teacher interactions that creates an environment where children gain necessary positive social skills (Ahnert et al., 2006). Miles and Stipek (2006) suggest that preschool teachers must address the needs of the whole child in intentional ways, including providing support for prosocial skill development. Prosocial behaviors are defined as socially responsible behaviors including empathy, cooperation and compliance (Frey, Nolen, Van Schoiack-Edstrom, & Hirshstein, 2005). Prosocial skills allow children to get along with others and include factors such as listening, getting help, cooperating, and entering a group, all of which are essential for academic success (Denham, 2005).

In order to succeed in school, children must learn to be empathetic, follow directions, and have self-control (Rimm-Kaufman et al., 2005; Wachs, Gurkas, & Kontos, 2004). Prosocial skills form the foundation of self-regulation, and allow a child to pay attention, problem-solve, and get along well with others (Blair, Denham, Kochanoff, & Whipple, 2004; Frey et al., 2005; Shonkoff, 2001). Cartledge and Milburn (1978) suggested that prosocial skills include independence, attention, persistence to task, self-control, compliance, and the ability to follow directions. The authors linked the lack of these skills to disadvantaged home environments. Together, the previous research established that prosocial skills allow children to be successful in relationships with others and form the foundation for social interactions that support early learning success and ongoing academic achievement.

Denham (2005) suggests that children who gain early emotional skills are able to competently negotiate both the adult and peer relationships necessary to become
successful in school. However, when children lack social skills, the deficit itself puts them at a disadvantage for gaining entry into the very relationships that would facilitate growth (Ladd, 2003; Buhs, Ladd, and Herald, 2006). In addition, it has been shown that teachers interact less frequently with these children in positive ways and provide for them fewer strategies of support (Good, 1987; Hart & Risley, 1995). The deficit is multifaceted. First, these children are disadvantaged by their own inability to create successful connections that help them become part of a group and build relationships. Second, they miss out on the positive peer interactions that would increase their social competence. And finally, the teacher herself communicates negative messages to and about these children that negatively impact the way they are perceived by their peers and others (Birch & Ladd, 1997). Denham et al. (2002) note that children identified by their peers or teachers as being socially withdrawn or aggressive in preschool are at risk for long-term social adjustment problems. Similarly, Buhs et al. (2006) provide evidence that the “likeability” and acceptance factor of a child (appealing to peers on the basis of social-emotional skills) is predictive of academic engagement, and this factor is ongoing in the school context. When children do not gain early prosocial skills, they are unable to connect with teachers, to gain their positive support, and further, are unable to sustain the peer relationships necessary to become successful in negotiating school.

With 62% of three to five year olds attending non-parental childcare, the non-parental caretaker relationship takes on substantial importance to the development of a child’s personality and perceptions of the world and himself. Children need to learn skills to perceive and interpret their own and other’s emotions, to regulate feelings, and to understand the complex interrelationship of emotions in social situations (Raikes & Thompson, 2006). According to the authors, emotional understanding is an important
requirement for school success. Children are unable to internalize healthy ways of resolving conflict unless adults provide them with accurate modeling, feedback and validation.

Similarly, Bennett et al. (2005) found that classroom management and disciplinary practices along with other teaching strategies were important predictors of change in children’s social and behaviors, noting that if adults are antagonistic, children develop patterns of aggression. Hestenes, Kontos, & Bryan (1993) found that the level of children’s positive or negative emotional levels were directly related to the modeling and emotional responses of the teacher. Other studies supported the correlation between levels of positive or negative interaction, behavior problems and achievement (Pettit, Bates, & Dodge, 1993, Dodge & Pettit, 2003).

Responsive, positive teacher-child interactions create short and long term benefits to children’s prosocial skill development. The impact on resiliency and psychological adjustment is well established. A relationship with a caring, responsive adult supported resiliency for children in spite of stress and other risk factors (Kersey & Malley, 2005; Koplow, 2002; Miller, 2001). Positive reciprocal relationships were shown to mediate the detrimental effects of stress and reduce long-term psychological problems (Miles & Stipek, 2006; Shonkoff, 2005; Shonkoff & Philips, 2001). Contributions to the understanding of "emotional literacy" and its impact on resiliency were summarized in the qualitative work of psychologists Kindlon and Thompson (2000). Children in preschool must gain emotional competence in order to be successful in negotiating relationships that will result in positive school adjustment. These studies together
support the need for further research on training programs that will be effective facilitating the development of prosocial skills in preschool children.

Just as social skills insure children's success in establishing meaningful relationships, academic skills for children are best supported through genuine, sensitive, caring relationships. Downer and Pianta (2006) refer to a child's social competence as a long-term predictor of academic success. Focused attention, problem solving, and positive social interaction skills significantly impact long-term school adjustment (Blair, Denham, Kochanoff, & Whipple, 2004). Children's prosocial skills have been consistently linked with short-term outcomes of school readiness as well as long-term outcomes of social adjustment, enhanced developmental growth, and increased academic and motivational outcomes. The development of prosocial skills sets the trajectory for future positive relationships between teachers and peers, which are critical to school success (Pianta & Stuhlman, 2004, Stipek, 1997; Wentzel, 1999).

The impact of teacher-child interactions on children's behaviors. Since young children spend up to 40 hours a week in preschool or more, the responsiveness of the adult-child interaction was particularly significant within the preschool context. Denham (2005) indicated that it is a child's interpretation and attribution of their own and other's behavior that creates patterns of social understanding, which, in turn, impact the ways that others respond to the child. The reciprocal nature of the adult-child relationship is critical, as children who have difficulty understanding emotions were found to be less emotionally competent (Denham, 2005). A strong body of evidence was presented that supported the link between children's prosocial competence and the nature and quality of teacher interactions.
The connection between teacher interaction techniques and resulting behavior is well established. As early as 1978, Cartledge & Milburn presented a defense for the prerequisite of prosocial behaviors needed for academic competence. The authors cited concurrent studies that suggested that teachers unintentionally reinforced behaviors they would like to eliminate, and they proposed a proactive focus on teacher strategies to support children’s prosocial skills. The reciprocal nature of interactions between student and teacher was emphasized, and the authors recommended the need for modeling of prosocial skills and teachers’ positive reinforcement of children’s positive social and emotional behaviors. Further, this study asserted that prosocial skills constituted an explicit rather than hidden curriculum and must be systematically taught.

Many studies have focused on the reciprocal nature of the adult-child interaction. The relationship of maternal responsiveness and subsequent social and verbal skill development of children was examined by Steelman, et al., (2002). An important contribution of this study was the operational definition of warm maternal responsiveness as, “a three-term chain of events.” The reciprocal nature of this cycle is an important descriptor of a quality interaction. The child initiates, the adult responds, and the child perceives the consequence. It is the quality of this interaction itself that has been linked to positive social and cognitive outcomes. There was a positive statistical relationship found between the extent of the adult’s supportive responsiveness and children’s prosocial outcomes. The study concluded that early maternal responsiveness at one year directly influenced prosocial skills for children 4.5 years of age. The link to a child’s future academic and social success was also established.
Intervention programs to support quality teacher-child relationships in childcare and preschool were recommended by O'Connor & McCartney (2006). Their study investigated the impact of the quality of the teacher-child relationship on predictor variables including attachment, school characteristics, child demographics, child characteristics, and family demographics. It was found that the lower a teacher's interaction quality, the more likely the child was to have behavior problems. This negative association had significant meaning for future relationships, as well. This study demonstrated that the quality of relationships between the child and teachers in preschool was a stronger predictor of future quality relationships with teachers than was the mother-child relationship.

Classroom factors and self-control were also investigated by Bennett, Elliott, & Peters, (2005). Two predictors of low self-control were the lack of adequate supplies and unmanageable class behavior. Interestingly, the researchers found lack of sufficient strategies for instruction, classroom management techniques and discipline to be linked to low self-control, and stated that these factors may be important predictors for negative prosocial outcomes.

Other aspects of teacher-child relationships were found to support both social and academic skills. The more a child could correctly identify and verbalize emotional understanding, the less likely he was to demonstrate behavior problems (Ackerman, & Youngstrom, 2001; Raikes & Thompson, 2006). Children were more willing to help, to listen, and to respond positively when they had been supported with choices and empathetic interaction, and had received positive prior interaction (Parpal & Maccoby, 1985). A warm, caring relationship with the teacher supported the development of
children’s self-control (Ahnert et al., 2006; Kestenbaum et al., 1989). Children who experienced sensitive, reciprocal interaction from adults developed more positive social skills, were more empathetic and responsive, and developed self-regulation (Eisenberg et al, 2005; Steelman et al., 2005).

An important component in prosocial skill functioning is the ability of a child to correctly identify and verbalize emotional understanding. The more a child was able to adequately express and identify feelings, the less frequent were his or her behavior problems (Raikes and Thompson; 2006). The focus of this study was the link between a mother’s responsiveness and the child’s ability to correctly identify emotional situations. The frequency of the mother’s responsive emotional interactions (interactions in which the mother identifies emotions by name) was compared to the child’s ability to correctly identify and express puppet scenarios using accurate emotional words. Children whose mothers used more emotional words had fewer behavior problems and were more successful in peer relationships, as well. The study showed a direct connection from mothers who use more emotional words to children who had greater emotional understanding. The frequency of the adult’s reference to emotion was the predictor of the child’s emotional understanding. This study highlighted the importance of the adult’s responsiveness on a child’s emotional and behavioral outcomes.

It was also found that the more parents responded empathetically to a child’s distress, the more likely the child would exhibit prosocial behavior towards others in distress. Davidov and Crusec (2006) investigated the impact of positive parent interactions on the preschool children’s prosocial behavior and self-regulation. The
greater a parent’s responsiveness to a child’s distress, the more the child responded with
empathy, emotional self-regulation, and prosocial behavior.

Emotional support also increased the quality of a child’s prosocial experience at
school. Quality teaching practices, when combined with strong emotional support, were
found to have mediating effects on children’s behaviors (Rimm-Kaufman et al., 2005).
When teachers provided higher levels of emotional support, their children responded
positively, demonstrated higher levels of prosocial skills and greater empathy (Denham &
Hewes, 1994). The teachers of these children demonstrated higher levels of positive
regard, were calm and consistent, and had low levels of stress.

Researchers also examined children over time to see if emotional self-regulation
was mediated by the nature of parent-child interactions. Eisenberg et al. (2005) found
that compliance and self-control were impacted by the quality of the adult-child
relationship. The warmth and positive expressivity in parenting style was a stronger
predictor than a child’s temperament on prosocial outcomes. Importantly, the strongest
effect took place prior to four years of age. The study highlighted the need to establish
prosocial behaviors in early childhood, as by mid-elementary school, a child’s emotional
self-regulation and externalizing behavior problems were found to be relatively stable.

Stanford University researchers Parpal & Maccoby (1985) examined the effects of
different adult-child interaction patterns on subsequent compliance in three and four year
old children. A predictive relationship was suggested between the prior condition of
reciprocal compliance and the child’s resulting cooperative compliance. The
experimental free playgroup was compared to a non-interactive playgroup. Results
indicated that the less directive a parent’s control, the more likely a child would be compliant. The researchers suggested the possibility that the increase in compliance resulted from the positive mood induced when the child felt in control.

Lay, Waters, & Park (1989) retested Parpal and Maccoby’s hypothesis that responsive parenting induced positive mood in children. They investigated the effects of verbally induced positive versus negative mood states in children to see if the induced mood impacted compliance outcomes. After the creation of either positive or negative mood experiences, mothers requested the children to sort blocks. The results indicated that a children’s positive mood mediated increases in compliance to maternal demands.

These specific investigations of adult behaviors have significant implications for teachers who work with young children. In each study, it was the adult’s precipitating or preceding behavior that set up the dynamics that caused the child’s prosocial response. Prosocial behaviors that increased included higher emotional understanding, empathy, emotional self-regulation, cooperation, and compliance. In addition, children were better behaved and showed the same behaviors to peers when positive interactions had been modeled or demonstrated to them. Children, whose teachers or parents were more responsive and expressive, were in turn more responsive and expressive to both the adults and to peers. Yet the children whose teachers or parents were inconsistent and less responsive demonstrated greater behavior problems. These interactions not only had an impact on self-regulation and compliance immediately, but the effects of low prosocial responding were found to persist long after the preschool years, and predicted future relationships with teachers and others. Strikingly, when young children had warm, responsive relationships with their teachers, they were more likely to have positive
relationships with teachers in the future, regardless of the quality of relationships with their mothers. In fact, other studies show that a relationship with the teacher may make up for a lack of maternal attachment (O’Connor & McCartney, 2006). In each of these studies, it was the quality of the teacher’s responsive interaction that impacted either positive or negative outcomes for the child, and these qualities were found to be particularly critical for children at risk.

Other studies focused on the way adults responded to children’s behaviors after they were presented. Using an interactive method called “The Child’s Game,” Kotler and McMahon (2004) studied the impact of children’s behaviors (i.e., anxious/withdrawn, angry/aggressive or socially competent) on mother’s subsequent response choices. Mothers were instructed to positively interact, and children’s compliance was measured. When children were anxious and withdrawn or angry and aggressive, mothers responded with negative and controlling demands. Of interest, the children who were more anxious and withdrawn responded with greater amounts of indirect noncompliance. Children who were angry and aggressive responded with more direct non-compliance. However, when mothers responded more positively, children in both groups responded with greater compliance.

The impact of teacher-child interactions on children’s compliance was also investigated by Wachs et al. (2004) in early childhood classroom settings. Eighty-six preschoolers and their mothers and children from 23 preschool classrooms were observed on levels of control in caregiver interaction and resulting compliance behaviors. Results indicated that caregivers’ use of controlling commands and hints of punishment were found to be more predictive of prosocial outcomes (including level of compliance) than
all other adult-child interactions. However, many factors were considered, including temperament, other caregiver behaviors, the quality of the day care, and the level of chaos. The researchers recommended further study to determine relevant developmental outcomes over time that may be influenced by the various processes of the early childhood classroom. This study attempted to explain the various contributions of classroom interactions that contribute to behavioral outcomes. It was found that the quality of adult interaction, particularly controlling and hints of punishment, did impact children’s prosocial behaviors.

It is important to note that the factors identified in the previous studies were more likely to increase positive prosocial outcomes for children. These included positive responsive support, the level of control, the use of punishment, and amount of positive interaction from both parents and teachers. Positive parental interaction style, a child’s basic temperament, responsive reciprocal interaction, less directive control, and induced positive mood were all shown to increase child compliance.

Since preschool children need to develop compliance, self-control, and cooperation in order to successfully negotiate the demands of school settings, the ability of teachers to assess and evaluate their own interaction practices is important. While research can describe the kinds of interactions that bring about more prosocial responses, both in the short and long term, it is not clear what kind of training is needed to insure they are established. Each of these studies strongly supports the need to increase teacher interactions that support prosocial skill development during a child’s critical preschool years.
The research literature on social-emotional development presents irrefutable evidence for positive, responsive teacher interaction practices to be implemented in childcare and early education classrooms. Some studies that provided recommendations for further research to identify effective training for teachers were sponsored by the US Department of Human Health and Services and include: The Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES), The Children of the Cost, Quality, and Outcomes Study, The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study, The Abecedarian Study, The Chicago Longitudinal Study, and The NICHD Study of Early Child Care. Each of these examined evidence over time, which established the importance of effective training programs for teachers to gain strategies that will support preschool children's social and emotional development (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2001). All supported the fact that children's success in school and life are facilitated by the prosocial skills that are learned in the early preschool years through high quality, responsive connections and interactions experienced with teachers and caregivers.

Young children are completely dependent on the responses, choices and guidance of the adults who care for them. In order to facilitate prosocial skill development, adults must be able to interact positively and responsively in the context of routines, meals, transitions and play, as well as in instructional situations. These patterns of interaction will impact children's future experiences in school, and increase the likelihood of maximizing educational and life potential. The need for quality experiences is critical for children at risk (Connell & Prinz, 2002), who depend on the level and quality of responsiveness of the caregiver. The authors suggest that while teachers' warm, emotionally responsive interactions are related to positive academic and social behavioral
outcomes, these desired outcomes are negatively impacted by the amount of teacher control and demands, as well as the ability of the teacher to structure activities without coercive discipline practices. Involving parents and administrators in training programs that promote social as well as academic development for low-income African American children was recommended. The current study fills the gap in the literature for a specific training program that will address discipline issues along with necessary responsive, positive teacher-child interactions in the preschool context for children at risk.

The implications of teacher attitudes on teacher interaction practices. A teacher might have a degree in child psychology or hold a teaching license, but have no idea what to do to organize or direct a classroom full of energetic, unfocused four year olds. In fact, a teacher's credentials may have little to do with the quality of teacher-child interactions or classroom outcomes (Haynes, 2008; Horn, Cheng, & Joseph, 2004). In spite of what is known about the need for emotional and social support for children, attitudes and misconceptions often hinder effective practice (Hamre & Pianta, 2005; Pinderhug, Dodge, Bates, Pettit, & Zelli, 2000). Some underlying barriers include cultural, discipline, and religious value beliefs that influence teacher approaches.

Attitudes and cultural norms concerning children are found to be important indicators of the types of strategies employed by adults in discipline and relational practices (Ispa & Halgunseth, 2004). Studies focusing on adult-child interactions (Pianta et al., 2005; Stipek, 2006) indicate that attitudes about children and childrearing may be significant predictors of interaction approaches. In fact, teacher attitudes and experiences may have more significant impact on choice of teaching practice than research-based training (Barkin, Scheindlin, Ip, Richardson, & Finch, 2007). Because the personal
background characteristics and experiences of the individual vary (Ispa & Halgunseth, 2004), it is not clear what types of training will be most effective in creating improvement in teacher interaction approaches.

Good (1987) synthesized two decades of research about teacher expectations, and found that students perceived as higher achievers were likely to receive a greater number of reciprocal interactions, less criticism, more opportunities to participate, and more support for both academic and social behaviors. Research by Hart and Risley (1995) suggests that children from poverty receive 500,000 fewer words of encouragement than more privileged children by the time they begin school, and because of this deficit, are even more in need of positive, supportive language-enriched approaches at school.

A teacher’s response to a child, particularly within a stressful interaction, may be based on preconceived ideas or beliefs, rather than on research. An important contribution to this discussion was provided by Thijs et al. (2008), who suggested that teachers’ professional interactions with students are similar to personal interactions, and depend on the evaluations, perceptions, and biases that adults may bring with them from their past experiences. The authors suggested that unconscious evaluations about children are influenced by teacher beliefs about behavioral practices, teacher control and support.

In addition, Forman (1990) suggested that teacher stress and coping mechanisms strongly influence responses to children. It was noted that the challenge of dealing with children’s disruptive behavior and a teacher’s inadequacy of training were contributors to teacher responses. Other factors included pressures related to home, school, and personal factors including a teacher’s tolerance level and need for control. Other cognitive-
emotional processes shown to be involved in a teacher’s interaction choices included self-perceptions, attributions about the causes of the child’s behavior, beliefs about defiance, and perceptions about control (Pinderhuges et al., 2000). Each of these studies sheds light on the need for teacher reflection and specific skill training in order to adequately address these complex issues.

A teacher’s ability to understand one’s own goals, intentions, and behaviors within social interaction requires a clear knowledge and understanding of one’s own feelings, and what the impact of these underlying factors will be to subsequent actions (Halberstadt, Denham, & Dunsmore, 2001). Because the teacher-child relationship includes a reciprocal response, it involves the cognitive-emotional processes of the teacher as well as the child. It is important that teachers gain understanding of the factors that influence their interaction decisions.

The statistics that confront educators are consistent, well documented, and addressed succinctly in literature from local school districts and the US Department of Education. For example, in a recent study, only 37% of students enrolled in Maryland’s schools were African-American, yet they made up 58% of the students who were suspended (Alam, 2002). Minority students received punitive disciplinary measures two to three times as much as non-minority students at elementary, middle, and high school levels (Serwatka, Deering, & Grant, 1995). Reports from the Children’s Defense Fund (2004) and U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights, (2001) show that school suspension, expulsion, and corporal punishment for African American students is more than double Caucasian students. The data reported for disproportionate discipline of minority students is consistent across state and national sources.
Bias and cultural attitudes significantly impact teacher reactions to students, as the behaviors of minority students are more often interpreted as disrespectful or threatening by teachers, and addressed accordingly (Harvard University National Summit, 2000). African American males, in particular, are disproportionately subjected to corporal punishment and discipline referral, and more often assigned to special education services for social-emotional and behavior issues. In addition, students at risk, who are most in need of supportive sensitive practices, were more likely to experience punitive approaches by teachers and administrators (Butchart, & McEwan; 1997; Fremon & Hamilton, 1997; McIntyre & Silva, 1992; Skiba, Michael & Nardo, 2005). Given the extent of disparity, these authors concluded that training for teachers in positive, responsive practices is even more significant for this population.

Researchers Ispa and Halgunseth (2004) investigated the impact of mothers’ attitudes within the context of a larger Early Head Start parenting intervention program and found that cultural beliefs and attitudes were a stronger influence than training in determining discipline practices. African American males were found to be disproportionately subjected to corporal punishment and other punitive practices, and were more often referred to special education services for behavior and emotional disorders Serwatka, Deering, & Grant, (1995). Skiba, Michael, & Nardo (2005) also found that other students were more likely to believe that low-income students were more likely to receive unfair disciplinary punishment. This study described higher rates of punishments being given to low-income students including yelling, separation, and searches, as well as more severe consequences. In addition, African American children
were more likely to be treated with punitive interactions by their parents, since parents often perceive this is in the best interest for their socialization (Pinderhugues et al., 2000).

In spite of what is known about the benefits of replacing punitive approaches, many teachers are found to be resistant to positive approaches, as adults may view submission to authority to be in a child’s best social interest. Pinderhugues et al., (2000) cite research by Kohn (1963) and others that links the use of punishment to ethnic differences. Underlying cultural beliefs are explored through the cognitive-emotional processes that may affect discipline responses. Other current studies show that resistance to positive approaches can be attributed to the teacher’s belief that low-income, African American students need more discipline and structure and less autonomy (Horsch, Chen, and Wagner, 2002). It is therefore imperative that training programs for positive, quality teacher-child interactions address the underlying attitudes about childrearing, culture, and discipline that prevent teachers from responding in alternative, constructive ways.

Bauman and Del Rio (2006) add an important contribution to the understanding of the impact of teacher beliefs on practice, as the researchers call for intervention programs to address bullying issues. They admit that most current intervention models do not work, because many teachers believe that student experiences like “toughening up” are necessary in order to deal with life’s challenges, and that “sticks and stones” is a necessary philosophy. Therefore, social behaviors such as exclusion and victimization are often not addressed or are excused in school contexts. The study found that teachers were not likely to take action when it concerned relational bullying. The authors suggested that teachers become desensitized in order to compensate for their own inability to successfully intervene. In addition, Bauman and Del Rio (2006) found that
victims may be less appealing to both their peers and their teachers, and therefore may not be helped and supported in learning effective coping measures. This important study concerning peer relationships sheds light on teacher beliefs that may provoke or inhibit teacher responses, even when intervention would be in the best interest of the children.

Studies by McCadden (1998) revealed that many teachers feel African American students may not receive enough discipline at home and therefore try to compensate by being stricter with them at school. The concept that the minority student is a “troublemaker” is persistent (Fremon & Hamilton, 1997). Children who are not liked by a teacher were shown to have more privileges taken away and receive more negative punishment than children who are liked. Unfortunately, harsh discipline approaches are also linked with inconsistency, which impacts a child’s ability to function (Patterson, 1986, in Pinderhugues et al., 2000). Given the bias and unfair application inherent in punitive approaches, it is extremely important that teachers become competent in providing positive, supportive practices so that discipline becomes fair and consistent to all students.

In addition to cultural beliefs, teachers’ responses to children can be impacted by personal beliefs about discipline. Many adults believe that children use emotions to be manipulative, and therefore a response that suppresses or controls the child’s emotional response will stop the child’s ability to use his feelings to manipulate others (Fabes, Poulin, Eisenberg, Madden-Derdich, 2003). As suggested by Kindlon & Thompson (2000), adults tend to minimize children’s emotions, rather than facilitate discussion about them. Further, teachers who believe children are “out to get them” or attribute other hostile intent are much more likely to punish and use punitive approaches (Dix,
Ruble & Zambarano, 1989; MacKinnon-Lewis, Lamb, Arbuckle, Baradaran, & Volling, 1992; Strassberg, 1995; Pinderhuges et al., 2000). Similarly, Thijs et al., (2008) report that when the relationship between teacher and child is unfavorable (i.e., negative, lacking regard or closeness), this also results in greater punitive consequences for the child.

Beliefs about control also affect adults’ punitive responses toward children, as adults who value obedience are more likely to have strong emotional reactions or become upset when they perceive behavior as being defiant (Dix, 1993; Dix & Lochman, 1990). Other research suggests that when adults feel a lack of control over children’s behavior, they tend to overreact to behavioral situations (Bugental, Blue, & Lewis, 1990). Conversely, teachers tend to respond more positively to children whom they perceive are socially compliant, while interpreting physically active behavior as being non-compliant (Hindshaw, 1987; Wenar & Kerig, 2000). In the same way, when children’s behavior is perceived as annoying, teachers are more likely to increase control. Not surprisingly, teachers do not tend to react positively unless they feel that effective, noncoercive strategies are available (Pinderhuges et al., 2000). The authors suggest that teachers who are under stress and who do not have support in learning new processes and strategies for behavior redirection tend to exhibit harsher reactions in discipline situations. These finding have significant application to the current study.

It is further possible that religious beliefs may be linked to endorsement of harsher discipline and more authoritarian approaches. Pinderhuges, et al. (2000) suggest that conservative religious beliefs about spanking may skew adult beliefs about what is harsh discipline. The authors note that teachers who are more emotionally reactive tend
to discipline more harshly. When taken together, these effects have substantial influence on teacher-child interaction outcomes.

In summary, even though it is well established that children need consistent, responsive emotional and social support, attitudes and misconceptions often hinder effective practice. The research clearly indicates that attitudes and cultural norms concerning children are important indicators of the types of strategies employed by adults in discipline and relational practices (Ispa & Halgunseth, 2004). Teachers were often shown to have resorted to interaction practices that undermined the learning process and disconnected relationships. However, teachers were more likely to use positive, responsive interactions when they were aware of effective strategies to replace punitive approaches.

* A model of change: The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline training. Based on Chris Argyris and Peter Senge's theories and summarized by Gene Bellinger (2004), teacher interaction choices may be based on previous experience, bias, or personal beliefs. A teacher's personal factors, perceptions and beliefs are influential in decision-making choices, along with social persuasion and the functional value of successful models (Bandura, 1977, 1991). By basing actions on selected perceptions, rather than on research, teachers continue to act out of subjective, rather than scientific motivations. By including self-observation and reflection as a primary mechanism for change in The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline model, it is hypothesized that underlying teacher attitudes will be impacted, and motivation for change in teacher-child interactions will be supported.
The elements *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* training are congruent with Elias' model of Transformative Leadership for Social-Emotional Learning (Collaboration for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning [CASEL], 2004). The components for this training model include self-awareness, social awareness, relational skills, decision-making, self-management, and ethical responsibility (Elias, O'Brien, & Weissberg, 2006). Therefore, a reflective process along with action implementation of strategies and skills will support the hypothesized changes. Rather than focus on deficits in children's behaviors, teachers will be trained to focus on proactive, strength-based skills and assessment (Nickerson, 2007). The goal of *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* is to provide teachers with skills to model and support social-emotional competence.

**Summary**

Taken together, the body of current research in early childhood education provides compelling evidence for the need for the current study. In spite of what is known about the short and long-term benefits of responsive, positive interactions, adult attitudes towards children and discipline as well as lack of training in specific alternative skills often hinder application of research to practice. With limited opportunity to observe high-quality responsive interactions in the classroom, teachers are rarely given the opportunity see how specific positive strategies can be effective. Finally, teachers need the opportunity to apply the strategies in their own classrooms, practice them, reflect on their implementation, and make adjustments to future approaches. The proposed training model for the current study allows for application of research to "real-life" practice in preschool classrooms with children at risk. The strategies and techniques
of *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* model fill an important gap in the literature, and are hypothesized to provide an effective and reliable bridge between research and practice in preschool classrooms.
Methodology

The purpose of the current study is to evaluate *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* training in Title 1 preschool classrooms in an urban school district. The mixed method design used for this study provided qualitative data, which substantiated quantitative elements of the study and helped provide a more comprehensive evaluation of the training program. Secondly, the qualitative portions of the study examined important beliefs and biases that may contribute to the existing gap between research and practice, and which may guide teachers' social-emotional and behavioral interaction approaches. The current chapter describes the setting, sample population, measurement instruments and data collection procedures that were followed to address the research questions of this study.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The research provided three questions that guide the data collection, methodology, and analysis, and three associated hypotheses.

*Question 1 and the associated hypothesis.* Does training in positive interaction techniques through *The 101s*, A Guide to Positive Discipline: impact measures of preschool teacher interaction quality including change in positive redirection of behavior and responsive social-emotional support, and will *The 101s* training affect measures of overall classroom interaction quality?

Hypothesis 1: Teachers who have been trained in the positive interaction techniques of *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* will have higher teacher interaction checklists scores for positive redirection of behavior skills and responsive social-emotional support, and higher CLASS Observation scores (Classroom Assessment
Scoring System, 2005) than the control group as measures of teacher interaction quality; and teacher interaction checklist scores will be correlated with CLASS Observation scores.

**Question 2 and the associated hypothesis.** Does the use of The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline positive interaction techniques (positive redirection of behavior and responsive social emotional support) impact measures of children’s prosocial outcomes?

Hypothesis 2: Children in the experimental group whose teachers attended The 101s training will have higher prosocial skill scores than children in the control group whose teachers did not attend The 101s training, and teacher interaction checklist scores and children’s prosocial checklist scores will be correlated.

**Question 3 and the associated hypothesis.** Does training in The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline impact teachers’ attitudes towards strategy support for children’s behavior?

Hypothesis 3: Training in The 101s A Guide to Positive Discipline will positively impact teachers’ attitudes towards strategy support for children’s behaviors.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses Summary**

The hypothesized outcomes, based on previous theoretical and research foundations, are that The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline training will increase teacher use of positive redirection skills and responsive social emotional support, and will increase overall classroom quality and child prosocial behaviors.

**Setting and Population**

The current study was implemented in 34 urban classrooms of three and four-year old preschool children. The teachers participating in the study were educators in at risk,
multi-racial, low economic status classrooms. In the district studied, 69% of four year olds and 89% of three year olds were African American. Funding for these classrooms was provided through Title 1; the Virginia Preschool Initiative, a state grants program; and district funding, including Title 1 and other sources. Over 60% of children were approved for free or reduced lunch. The teacher participants were representative of the ethnic and educational distribution of licensed public school teachers in the district. A total population of 105 teachers and classrooms were part of the study and over 1600 children were part of these classrooms. Of these classes, 17 served 274 three year olds. All of these classrooms were currently serving at capacity.

Of the total population of 105 teachers in the district, half were chosen by random sampling to be the intervention group which received *The 10Is* training and the remaining half were the control group. Due to the time constraints of the semester, only 34 classroom observations were completed; however order of observation was followed by the original terms of random assignment.

*Instruments and Materials*

Observations of teachers were conducted using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), an observation measure of overall global classroom quality (Pianta et al., 2008). The CLASS dimensions include three domains: emotional support, classroom organization, and instructional support. The dimensions that make up the domain of emotional support include positive climate, negative climate, teacher sensitivity, and regard for student perspectives. The dimensions that make up the domain of classroom organization include behavior management, productivity, and instructional
formats. The dimensions that make up instructional support include concept development, quality of feedback, and language modeling.

As the domains most closely associated with the focus of the current study included the four dimensions of emotional support (positive climate, negative climate, teacher sensitivity, and regard for student perspectives) and one dimension of classroom organization (behavior management), these dimensional cores will be used to evaluate *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* training model. While all CLASS data was collected during the current study, only the dimensional elements associated with the focus of this study will be reported. The data will be used to investigate changes in overall classroom quality before and after implementation of *The 101s* training intervention.

**Measures**

The research data consisted of Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), *The 101s* Teacher and Child Behaviors Checklists, and an attitudes questionnaire. Pretest and post-test measures included two-hour cycles of classroom observations. Each cycle included a 20-minute observation followed by a 10-minute scoring period. Four cycles were completed for each classroom. In order to obtain reliable data across various environments and experiences of preschoolers, observations were completed during various aspects of the school day including instruction, learning centers, play periods, transitions, and meals.

The inter-rater reliability agreement across dimensions for the CLASS is 78.8-96.9. Inter-rater reliability of coding is .87. Correlation across four cycles was stable and ranged from .84 to .91. The internal consistency across scores was strongest in
the emotional support dimension with other dimensions ranging from .89 to .90. For the current study, inter-rater reliability was supported by the use of three independent raters who received reliability scores of .85 to .93. Prior to the start of the study and pretest assessments, all classroom observers received reliability and consistency ratings for the CLASS observation system through professional training and certification in CLASS. For further information, please see the technical manual for the assessment at:


The 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist was used to identify changes in specific interaction practices that were supported by The 101's A Guide to Positive Discipline training program. The pretest and post-test teacher behavior checklists were utilized during four 20-minute cycles concurrent with the CLASS observation. The checklist scales were established using behaviors operationally defined to describe teacher’s redirection and responsive emotional support of behaviors and that correlated to The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline. For the purpose of the current study, these checklists were pilot-tested to establish correlation to the CLASS observation system. Additional time was taken after CLASS and checklist scoring to record detailed researcher notes and supportive qualitative data via observation notes.

Observations of children’s behaviors were conducted using The 101s Child Prosocial Behavior Checklist. The pretest and post test observations included four 20-minute cycles concurrent with the CLASS observation. This scale was established using behaviors operationally defined to describe specific positive prosocial skills in previous literature as well as other valid checklists and are supported by the literature review in Chapter 2. Values for construct validity were established by a Chronbach’s
alpha of .95. While components of children's prosocial skill behaviors are highly correlated, previous research supports the unique contribution of individual prosocial behaviors, which are well documented across substantiated research. Additional time was taken during and after CLASS and checklist scoring to record detailed qualitative researcher notes to further document children's behavior in each dimension.

Materials

*The 101s Training Manual* was created through documentation of previous trainings and detailed researcher notes from observations of pilot trainings and procedures. The final materials were pilot-tested at the Old Dominion University (ODU) Directors' Institute. The manual was carefully organized to reflect answers to questions and common interactions of participants, and to standardize protocol for future trainings so that the research could be replicated. The CD created for the training manual contained each of the principles taught through *The 101s* training model (commonly referred to as "the top ten") that were filmed in the ODU Child Study Center and again in a Title 1 school. The manual was followed during one 90-minute training session, and participants kept the manual after training with interactive materials to use as a review and reference, and as a resource for classroom application.

Procedures

Prior to the beginning of the study, meetings were conducted with school district personnel to submit a formal proposal required for research approval. Human subjects' exempt status was obtained from ODU. All participants received informed consent documents explaining that the research would be conducted as a regular part of the district professional development training, and permission was given to opt out of the
study (Appendix A). Lists of schools and teachers were obtained, along with the district calendar and contact information for each building. It was agreed that prior to arriving at each school destination, observers would contact school personnel to notify them in advance. The district sent e-mail correspondence to principals in the district as well as to teachers, in order to inform them of the details of the study.

For the purpose of the study, experimental and control group conditions were created. A table of random numbers was used to select from 37 schools and 105 teachers. Secondary random selection was used to assign teachers to observation order. Teachers assigned to the intervention group were scheduled for 90 minutes of professional training. Three weeks of implementation time was provided after training for post-test observations.

Materials for The 101s training sessions included a training manual designed for the current study (Appendix B) and a DVD film of The 101s implemented in preschool classrooms. Resources for classroom implementation included application and reflection materials. The attitudes questionnaire (Appendix C) was included in the training packet with a stamped return envelope. A VCR-DVD monitor was used to provide viewing to participants during training. Water and snacks were provided to participants during training, which was held at the regular professional development training location of the district during the district’s normal professional development calendar schedule.

The training procedure for the 90-minute sessions followed a specific, replicable protocol from The 101s Training Manual, which focused on the changing of teacher behaviors with the use of a training DVD. Specific techniques and skills for responsive interactions were taught and demonstrated. Classroom application suggestions were
made for implementation of The 101s principles into interaction practice. As part of the training materials, a self-checklist for responsive interactions and positive behavior redirection were provided (Appendix D), along with a list of prosocial behaviors (Appendix E) in order to clarify the objectives of the training. Opportunity was given for personal reflection about attitudes and approaches toward discipline and teacher interactions. These elements allowed participants to evaluate personal experiences that may have influenced or contributed to their previous interaction choices. The training DVD was given along with the training manual to each participant in the intervention group.

DATA ANALYSIS

A quasi-experimental design was utilized for the study, as an entire urban school district was available as a convenience sample. However, to increase external validity, all schools and teachers were randomly assigned to control and treatment groups. Pretest and post test scores for CLASS observation assessment and The 101s checklists of teacher and child behaviors were compared across groups.

For hypothesis 1, the impact of the independent variable (teacher training or no teacher training) on two dependent variables (positive teacher redirection of behavior, and responsive social-emotional support) was examined as measured by scores on The 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist. Overall classroom quality was measured using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS). One-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were examined to determine between-group differences. Eta Square statistics were used to explain the strength of relationship between the independent and dependent variables, as all data from the study were categorical in nature. Correlation statistics were
computed on scores from the CLASS measure and *The 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist*.

For hypothesis 2, analysis included examination of the impact of the independent variables (teacher positive redirection of behavior and responsive social emotional interactions) on dependent variable outcomes for child prosocial skills. After descriptive statistics were obtained, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were run to examine the relationship between the predictor variables of teachers' positive redirection of behavior and responsive social emotional support on the outcome variables (children's level of prosocial skills) for emotional self-regulation, self-control, attentiveness, compliance, helping, asking, sharing, and cooperation. Post hoc statistics explained between group differences that could be attributed to *The 101s* intervention training.

For hypothesis 3, to examine significant contributions of culture, previous experience, and racial bias, qualitative data were collected from attitude questionnaires, detailed observation notes, and returned homework assignments. The questionnaire data described personal, experiential and attitudinal factors that impacted a teacher's approach to classroom adult-child interaction practices. Data were examined for possible trends that would help the researcher evaluate *The 101s* training. Because the aim of the study was to examine the impact of *The 101s* training on positive teacher redirection of behavior and responsive interactions, and second, to measure the impact of those behaviors on children's prosocial skills as measured by *The 101s* Child Prosocial Behavior Checklist and the CLASS observation scores, all relevant data were considered in the evaluation. Qualitative data was used to support quantitative measurements that
described the impact of the current intervention, and provided substantiation for relevant theory development and formation of future training and assessment tools.
Results

This chapter presents the results of the analysis performed that addressed the research questions of this study. Research questions and methodology design provided the structure for this section. For research question one, after preliminary descriptive analysis, group means were analyzed for *The 101s* Teacher Checklist scores and for CLASS scores before and after *The 101s* training. Additionally, correlation analyses were performed to investigate connections between group scores for pretest and post-test comparisons of *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* Teacher Interaction Checklist scores (positive redirection skills and responsive social-emotional support) and CLASS observation scores (positive climate, negative climate, sensitivity, regard for student perspectives, and behavior management).

For research question two, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to investigate possible significant differences between group after *The 101s* training for *The 101s* Child Prosocial Skills Checklist, and effect size statistics were reported. Further correlation analyses examined the relationship between the dimensions of *The 101s* Teacher Interaction Checklist (positive redirection skills and responsive social-emotional support) and *The 101s* Child Prosocial Skills Checklist scores for emotional self-regulation, self-control, attentiveness, compliance, helping, asking, sharing, and cooperation.

For research question three, qualitative content analysis of participant training documents was completed. Questionnaires, researcher observation notes, and written feedback were analyzed and summarized to provide support for the quantitative data of this study.
Relationship Between The 101s Training and Teacher Positive Redirection Skills

One-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were examined separately for The 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist scores for the dimension of positive redirection skills and for responsive social-emotional support. Prior to statistical analysis, underlying assumptions of ANOVA for normality and homoscedasticity were examined. The range of skewness and kurtosis were used as indexes of normal distribution. Most variables were located within the -1 to +1 range. Homogeneity of variance was analyzed using Levines statistic, which showed all CLASS scores for this study had equal variances across groups. Most 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist scores had equal variance across groups. The ANOVA model was determined to be robust enough to tolerate minor violations of this assumption.
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Teacher Interaction Checklist for Positive Redirection of Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mkbigdeapre</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.1397</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mkbigdeapost</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.0956</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iapre</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.5147</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iapost</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>2.5809</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talkpospre</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.6324</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talkpospost</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.5682</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extinctpre</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.8258</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extinctpost</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1.7879</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between pretest and posttest mean differences for control teachers who did not receive *The 101s* training and experimental group teachers who received training as indicated by 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist scores in the dimension of positive redirection skills. For Make a Big Deal Principle, the ANOVA was significant (F (1, 32) =22.45, p <.01) (See Table 2). Post Hoc results indicated the variance of group means differed significantly between *The 101s* training group and control group. *The 101s* intervention group (M = 4.69, SD = 2.26) had higher scores than the control group (M = 1.29, SD = 1.87). The Eta square statistic was large, with 36% portion of variance in teacher interaction scores that can be explained by *The 101s* training model (η² = .36) (See Table 3). It shows the amount of variance in teacher interaction scores that can be uniquely explained by *The 101s* training.
Table 2

ANOVA Table of Teacher Interaction Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mkbigdeapre * group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td>8.007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>137.767</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>145.774</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mkbigdeapost * group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>97.780</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>139.347</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>237.127</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iapre * group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td>6.615</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>118.628</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>125.243</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iapost * group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td>71.118</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>96.972</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>168.090</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>talkpospre * group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td>6.851</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>137.429</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>144.279</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>talkpospost * group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td>47.760</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>140.899</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>188.659</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extinctpre * group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td>5.881</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.930</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.811</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extinctpost * group</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td>47.833</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>151.557</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>199.390</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Incompatible Alternative Principle, the ANOVA was significant
\( F (1, 32) = 23.47, p < .01 \) (See Table 2), indicating statistically significant differences between The 101s training group and the control group. The 101s intervention group (M = 3.9, SD = 1.97) had higher scores than the control group (M = 1.04, SD = 1.42). The Eta square statistic was large, with 37% of variance that can be explained by The 101s training model (\( \eta^2 = .37 \)) (See Table 3).

For Talk Positively about Others Principle, the ANOVA was significant
\( F (1.31) = 10.50, p < .01 \) (See Table 2), showing statistically significant differences between The 101s training group and the control group. The 101s intervention group (M = 3.73, SD = 2.34) had higher scores than the control group (M = 1.32, SD = 1.87). Eta square statistic for this variable was 21%, which is close to a large effect size
(η² = .21) (See Table 3). Figure 1 indicates the comparison between control group scores of teachers who did not receive *The 101s* training, and experimental group teachers who did receive *The 101s* training.

Figure 1. Teacher Positive Redirection Skills

*Relationship between The 101s Training and Responsive Social-emotional Support*

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between pretest and post-test control and experimental groups *101s Teacher Interaction Checklist* scores in the dimension of responsive social-emotional support.
Prior to statistical analysis, underlying assumptions of ANOVA for normality and homoscedasticity were examined. The range of skewness and kurtosis were used as indexes of normal distribution. Most variables were located within the $-1$ to $+1$ range (See Table 4).

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Teacher Interaction Checklist for Responsive Social Emotional Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validpre</th>
<th>Validpost</th>
<th>Eyelvpre</th>
<th>Eyelvpost</th>
<th>Timeinpre</th>
<th>Timeinpost</th>
<th>Modepre</th>
<th>Modepost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeanStatistic</td>
<td>1.2121</td>
<td>1.4730</td>
<td>2.1136</td>
<td>3.7426</td>
<td>3.1029</td>
<td>3.6912</td>
<td>1.2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std.Error</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.84679</td>
<td>2.13157</td>
<td>2.48282</td>
<td>2.58381</td>
<td>2.72065</td>
<td>2.59381</td>
<td>2.72065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>-.376</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.305</td>
<td>1.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>1.420</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Validation Principle, the ANOVA was significant ($F(1, 32) = 8.65, p < .01$). Post Hoc results indicated that group means differed significantly between the *The 101s* training group and control group. *The 101s* intervention group ($M = 2.36, SD = 2.40$) had higher scores than the control group ($M = .47, SD = 1.89$) (See Table 5). The strength of relationship was medium, with 16% portion of variance in teacher interaction scores that can be explained by *The 101s* training model ($\eta^2 = .16$) (See Table 6).
### ANOVA Table of Teacher Interaction Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>validpre * group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>4.960</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.960</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>104.180</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109.140</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>validpost * group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>30.481</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.481</td>
<td>8.165</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>119.457</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149.939</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>eyelvpre * group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>29.405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.405</td>
<td>5.431</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>167.856</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>197.261</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>eyelvpost * group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>55.245</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.245</td>
<td>10.710</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>165.066</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>220.311</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>timeinpre * group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>32.716</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.716</td>
<td>4.949</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>211.549</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>244.265</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>timeinpost * group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>49.898</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.898</td>
<td>9.449</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>168.984</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218.882</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>modepre * group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>1.506</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.506</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>115.426</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116.932</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>modepost * group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>26.667</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.667</td>
<td>4.496</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>189.804</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216.471</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Measures of Association for Teacher Interaction Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>validpre * group</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>validpost * group</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eyelvpre * group</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eyelvpost * group</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timeinpre * group</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timeinpost * group</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modepre * group</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modepost * group</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Get on the Child’s Eye Level Principle, the ANOVA was significant (F (1, 32) = 10.71, p < .01). Results indicated group means differed significantly between The 101s training group and control group. The 101s intervention group (M = 4.94, SD = 2.06) had higher scores than the control group (M = 2.39, SD = 2.48) (See Table 5). The effect size was medium, with .10% portion of variance in teacher interaction scores that can be explained by The 101s training model (\( \eta^2 = .16 \)) (See Table 6).

For Time In Principle, the ANOVA was significant (F (1, 32) = 9.45, p < .01). Post Hoc results indicated that group means differed significantly between The 101s training group and control group. The 101s intervention group (M = 4.83, SD = 2.15) had higher scores than the control group (M = 2.40, SD = 2.45) (See Table 5). The strength of relationship was almost medium, with 9% portion of variance in teacher interaction scores that can be explained by The 101s training model (\( \eta^2 = .09 \)) (See Table 6).
For Modeling Principle, the ANOVA was significant (F (1, 32) = 4.49, p < .01). Post Hoc results indicated that the group means differed significantly between The 101s training group and control group. The 101s intervention group (M = 2.80, SD = 2.79) had higher scores than the control group (M = 1.03, SD = 1.95) (See Table 5). The strength of relationship was medium, with 11% portion of variance in teacher interaction scores that can be explained by The 101s training model (\(\eta^2 = .11\)) (See Table 6). Figure 2 indicates the comparison between control group scores of teachers who did not receive The 101s training, and experimental group teachers who did receive The 101s training.

Figure 2. Teacher Responsive Social Emotional Support
In summary, for hypothesis 1, examination between group differences of the experimental group teachers who received The 101s training and the control group teachers who did not receive training revealed significant group differences across each dimension, with The 101s training group having significantly higher 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist scores. Table 5 displays the results of ANOVA for pre and post 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist dimensions. For both positive redirection of behavior skills and responsive social-emotional support, teachers who attended The 101s training had higher 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist scores than control group participants who did not attend training, which confirms hypothesis 1.

Relationship Between 101s Training and CLASS Observation Dimension Scores

To evaluate group mean differences between groups for CLASS Observation scores, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare pre and post scores for the experimental group classrooms where teachers received The 101s training and control group classrooms where teachers did not receive The 101s training. Figure 3 indicates the comparison between control group scores of teachers who did not receive The 101s training, and experimental group teachers who did receive The 101s training in the CLASS dimensions of Social-Emotional Support.
For Positive Climate, ANOVA was significant ($F (1, 34)=15.59, p < .01$).
(See Table 7 for $F$ statistics). Post Hoc tests showed that *The 101s* intervention group ($M = 5.60, SD = 1.3$) had higher scores than the control group ($M = 3.70, SD = 1.62$).
Effect size was medium large ($\eta^2 = .20$), indicating that 20% variance between groups can be explained by *The 101s* training. (See Table 8 for effect size statistics).
For Teacher Sensitivity, ANOVA was significant ($F(1, 34) = 22.95, p < .01$) (See Table 7 for F statistics). Post Hoc tests showed that *The 101s* intervention group (M = 5.58, SD = 1.37) had higher scores than the control group (M = 3.29, SD = 1.50). Effect size was medium large ($\eta^2 = .20$) (See Table 8 for effect size statistics), indicating that 20% variance between groups can be explained by *The 101s* training.
### Table 7

**ANOVA Table of CLASS scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pospreave * group</td>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>12.057</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.057</td>
<td>4.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>90.057</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102.114</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pospostave * group</td>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>33.543</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.543</td>
<td>15.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>73.142</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106.686</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negpreave * group</td>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>4.112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.112</td>
<td>4.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>33.901</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.013</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negpostave * group</td>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>4.340</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.340</td>
<td>3.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>43.340</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.681</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senspreave * group</td>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>20.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.002</td>
<td>8.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>77.820</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97.822</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senspostave * group</td>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>47.266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.266</td>
<td>22.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>70.031</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117.297</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspreave * group</td>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>11.206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.206</td>
<td>4.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>90.464</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101.671</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspostave * group</td>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>48.418</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.418</td>
<td>21.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>75.503</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123.922</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behmanpreave * group</td>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>7.185</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.185</td>
<td>3.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>62.251</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69.436</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behmanpostave * group</td>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>36.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.000</td>
<td>16.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>73.625</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110.625</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

*Measures of Association for Teacher Interaction Checklist*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pospreave * group</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pospostave * group</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negpreave * group</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negpostave * group</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senspreave * group</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senspostave * group</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persppreave * group</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persppostave * group</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behmanpreave * group</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behmanpostave * group</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the dimension of Regard for Student Perspectives, ANOVA was significant (F (1, 34) = 21.80, p < .01) (See Table 7 for F statistics). Post Hoc tests showed that *The 101s* intervention group (M = 5.60, SD = 1.34) had higher scores than the control group (M = 3.27, SD = 1.62). Effect size was large ($\eta^2 = .28$) (See Table 8 for effect size statistics), indicating that 28% variance between groups can be explained by *The 101s* training.

For Behavior Management, ANOVA was significant (F (1, 34) = 16.62, p < .01) (See Table 7 for F statistics). Post Hoc tests showed that *The 101s* intervention group (M = 5.25, SD = 1.34) had higher scores than the control group (M = 3.25, SD = 1.60). (See Figure 4). Effect size was medium large ($\eta^2 = .22$) (See Table 8 for effect size statistics) indicating that 22% variance between groups can be explained by *The 101s* training.
In summary, the ANOVA results indicated that teachers who received *The 101s* training had significantly higher CLASS Observation scores for Positive Climate, Teacher Sensitivity, regard for Student Perspectives, and for Behavior Management dimensions than the control group teachers, which confirms Hypothesis 1. Figure 3 indicates the comparison between control group scores of teachers who did not receive *The 101s* training, and experimental group teachers who did receive *The 101s* training on CLASS scores.

Figure 4: CLASS Behavior Management Dimension
Relationship between 101s Teacher-Interaction Checklists and CLASS Observation Scores

To test the hypothesis that 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist scores would be related with CLASS Observation scores, correlation analysis were used to examine the relationship between assessment outcomes. For The 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist dimension of teacher positive redirection skills, Make a Big Deal Principle scores were highly positively correlated with CLASS scores for Positive Climate \( (r = .82, p < .01) \), Teacher Sensitivity \( (r = .88, p < .01) \), Regard for Student Perspectives \( (r = .85, p < .01) \), and Behavior Management \( (r = .86, p < .01) \). Incompatible Alternative Principle scores were highly positively correlated with CLASS scores for Positive Climate \( (r = .78, p < .01) \), Teacher Sensitivity \( (r = .86, p < .01) \), Regard for Student Perspectives \( (r = .73, p < .01) \), and for Behavior Management \( (r = .81, p < .01) \). Talk Positively About Others Principle scores were highly positively correlated with CLASS scores for Positive Climate \( (r = .81, p < .01) \), for Teacher Sensitivity \( (r = .85, p < .01) \), Regard for Student Perspectives \( (r = .83, p < .01) \), and Behavior Management \( (r = .84, p < .01) \). Finally, Extinction Principle scores were highly positively correlated with CLASS scores for Positive Climate \( (r = .62, p < .01) \), Teacher Sensitivity \( (r = .63, p < .01) \), for Regard for Student Perspectives \( (r = .65, p < .01) \), and Behavior Management \( (r = .60, p < .01) \) (See Table 9).
Table 9

Correlations for the 101s Positive Redirection Skills and CLASS Dimension Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mtbideapost</th>
<th>lapost</th>
<th>talkpospost</th>
<th>extinctpost</th>
<th>pospostave</th>
<th>negpostave</th>
<th>senspostave</th>
<th>persppostave</th>
<th>behmanpostave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mkbigdea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.897**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.845**</td>
<td>.640**</td>
<td>.648**</td>
<td>.897*</td>
<td>.818*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iapost</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.818**</td>
<td>.663**</td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipplespospost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.910**</td>
<td>.622**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extinctpost</td>
<td>.924**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.777**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.910**</td>
<td>.622**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.924**</td>
<td>.777**</td>
<td>.910**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pospostave</td>
<td>.640**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.663**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.910**</td>
<td>.622**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.645**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.522**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.540**</td>
<td>.622**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negpostave</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td></td>
<td>.324</td>
<td></td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td>.612**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.910**</td>
<td>.622**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td></td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senspostave</td>
<td>.877*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.864**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.845**</td>
<td>.891**</td>
<td>.545**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.910**</td>
<td>.891**</td>
<td>.545**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persppostave</td>
<td>.848**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.732**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.833**</td>
<td>.861**</td>
<td>.690**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.910**</td>
<td>.861**</td>
<td>.690**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behmanpostave</td>
<td>.859**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.810**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.838**</td>
<td>.867**</td>
<td>.897**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.910**</td>
<td>.867**</td>
<td>.897**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

For The 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist dimension of responsive social-emotional support, Validation Principle scores were highly positively correlated with CLASS scores for Positive Climate (r = .73, p < .01), Teacher Sensitivity (r = .73, p < .01), Regard for Student Perspectives (r = .72, p < .01), and Behavior Management (r = .78, p < .01). Get on The Child’s Eye Level Principle scores were highly positively correlated with Positive Climate (r = .82, p < .01), Teacher Sensitivity (r = .85, p < .01), Regard for Student Perspectives (r = .80, p < .01), and Behavior Management (r = .83, p < .01). Time In Principle scores were highly positively
correlated with Positive Climate ($r = .80$, $p < .01$), Teacher Sensitivity ($r = .84$, $p < .01$),
Regard for Student Perspectives ($r = .83$, $p < .01$), and Behavior Management
($r = .86$, $p < .01$). Finally, Modeling Principle scores were highly positively correlated
with Positive Climate ($r = .70$, $p < .01$), Teacher Sensitivity ($r = .71$, $p < .01$), Regard for
Student Perspectives ($r = .67$, $p < .01$), and Behavior Management ($r = .77$, $p < .01$) (See
Table 10).

Table 10

Correlations for the 101s Responsive Social Emotional Support and CLASS Dimension
Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>validpost</th>
<th>eyelpost</th>
<th>timeinpost</th>
<th>modepost</th>
<th>pospostave</th>
<th>negpostave</th>
<th>senspostave</th>
<th>perspostave</th>
<th>behmanpostave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>validpost</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eyelpost</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.680**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timeinpost</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.720**</td>
<td>.623**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modepost</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.757**</td>
<td>.651**</td>
<td>.688**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pospostave</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.729**</td>
<td>.615**</td>
<td>.790**</td>
<td>.582**</td>
<td>.711**</td>
<td>.545**</td>
<td>.587**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negpostave</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.381**</td>
<td>.410*</td>
<td>.386*</td>
<td>.512**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senspostave</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.734**</td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>.839**</td>
<td>.711**</td>
<td>.891**</td>
<td>.545**</td>
<td>.890**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspostave</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.717**</td>
<td>.795**</td>
<td>.832**</td>
<td>.665**</td>
<td>.861**</td>
<td>.490**</td>
<td>.890**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behmanpostave</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.777**</td>
<td>.634**</td>
<td>.859**</td>
<td>.771**</td>
<td>.873**</td>
<td>.587**</td>
<td>.958**</td>
<td>.897**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
In summary, two positive correlation directions were documented. Teachers who attended *The 101s* training were found to have both higher *101s Teacher Interaction Checklist* scores and higher CLASS Observation scores. *The 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist* scores were found to be positively correlated with CLASS dimensions of Emotional Support, including Positive Climate, Teacher Sensitivity, and Regard for Student Perspectives as well as for Behavior Management. These correlation results confirmed the hypothesis that the experimental group teachers who received *The 101s* training would have higher *101s Teacher Interaction Checklist* scores and CLASS dimension scores than the control group who did not receive *The 101s* training.

**Relationship Between 101s Training and Children’s Prosocial Skills**

Hypothesis 2 proposed that children in the experimental group whose teachers attended *The 101s* training would have higher prosocial skill scores than children in the control group whose teachers did not attend *The 101s* training and that *101s Teacher Interaction Checklist* scores and Children’s Prosocial Checklist scores would be correlated. A One-way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were conducted to identify significant differences between group means before and after *The 101s* training. See Table 11 descriptive data for children’s prosocial skills of emotional regulation, self-control, attention, and compliance. See Table 12 for children’s prosocial skills of helping, asking, sharing, and cooperation.
Table 11

*Child Prosocial Checklist*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>group</th>
<th>emregpre</th>
<th>emregpost</th>
<th>selfctrpre</th>
<th>selfctrpost</th>
<th>attntpre</th>
<th>attntpost</th>
<th>cmplncepre</th>
<th>cmplncepost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.47886</td>
<td>1.61369</td>
<td>2.05883</td>
<td>1.72837</td>
<td>1.85940</td>
<td>1.91240</td>
<td>1.39574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.9271</td>
<td>5.4552</td>
<td>4.1765</td>
<td>5.4491</td>
<td>4.7222</td>
<td>5.6852</td>
<td>4.6620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.27613</td>
<td>1.47378</td>
<td>1.42548</td>
<td>1.40085</td>
<td>1.40551</td>
<td>1.28133</td>
<td>1.18698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.629</td>
<td>2.172</td>
<td>2.032</td>
<td>1.962</td>
<td>1.975</td>
<td>1.642</td>
<td>1.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.34867</td>
<td>1.90456</td>
<td>1.75434</td>
<td>1.88523</td>
<td>1.62919</td>
<td>1.62862</td>
<td>1.26945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

Child Prosocial Checklist 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>group</th>
<th>helppre</th>
<th>helppost</th>
<th>askpre</th>
<th>askpost</th>
<th>sharepre</th>
<th>sharepost</th>
<th>cooperpre</th>
<th>cooperpost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.7727</td>
<td>3.9821</td>
<td>4.4444</td>
<td>4.2075</td>
<td>4.6111</td>
<td>3.5630</td>
<td>4.2430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.2354</td>
<td>6.1222</td>
<td>4.0588</td>
<td>6.0388</td>
<td>3.7348</td>
<td>5.7273</td>
<td>4.7361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>2.26234</td>
<td>2.22652</td>
<td>1.82387</td>
<td>2.29099</td>
<td>1.61589</td>
<td>2.07579</td>
<td>2.02811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>5.118</td>
<td>4.957</td>
<td>3.327</td>
<td>5.249</td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td>4.309</td>
<td>4.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.0385</td>
<td>5.0891</td>
<td>4.1923</td>
<td>5.2810</td>
<td>4.1292</td>
<td>4.7062</td>
<td>4.5389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.86195</td>
<td>1.96205</td>
<td>1.78478</td>
<td>1.81183</td>
<td>1.53338</td>
<td>2.03772</td>
<td>1.66909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>3.467</td>
<td>3.850</td>
<td>3.185</td>
<td>3.283</td>
<td>2.351</td>
<td>4.152</td>
<td>2.786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all eight prosocial skill dimensions, including emotional regulation, compliance, helping, cooperation, self-control, attention, asking, and sharing were shown to be significantly higher for the experimental group after teachers received *The 101s* training (See Table 14). Experimental group teachers had significantly higher mean scores than control group teachers (See Table 13). The ANOVA results indicated that children with teachers who received *The 101s* training had statistically higher prosocial skill scores than children in the control group, with the largest effect sizes for emotional regulation (35% variance change), compliance (36% variance change), helping (29% variance change), and cooperation (29% variance change).
Table 13

ANOVA Table of Total Child Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>emregpre</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>48.485</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.111</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>emregpost</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>35.418</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.418</td>
<td>14.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>62.520</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.405</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97.938</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>selfctrpre</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.715</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.715</td>
<td>1.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>87.616</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.021</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92.331</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>selfctrpost</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>39.683</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.683</td>
<td>16.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>81.157</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.459</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120.839</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>attntpre</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.148</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>85.443</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.670</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87.591</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>attntpost</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>27.890</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.890</td>
<td>10.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>79.113</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.552</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107.003</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cmplncepre</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>53.173</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.662</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53.170</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cmplncepost</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>40.920</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.920</td>
<td>18.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>71.583</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.169</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112.503</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>helppre</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>85.324</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.555</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86.671</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>helppost</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>33.164</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.164</td>
<td>11.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>74.626</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.764</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107.790</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>askpre</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>78.761</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.282</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79.636</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>askpost</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>23.592</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.592</td>
<td>9.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>66.325</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.531</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91.917</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sharepre</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.801</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.801</td>
<td>1.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>40.873</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.271</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44.674</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sharepost</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>24.084</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.084</td>
<td>7.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>58.902</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83.046</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cooperpre</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>79.039</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80.790</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cooperpost</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>26.070</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.070</td>
<td>14.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>55.588</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81.658</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

*Measures of Association for Total Child Checklist*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>emregpre * group</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emregpost * group</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfctrpre * group</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfctrpost * group</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attntpre * group</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attntpost * group</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cmpincepre * group</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cmpincepost * group</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helppre * group</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helppost * group</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>askpre * group</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>askpost * group</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharepre * group</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharepost * group</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperpre * group</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperpost * group</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship between Teacher Positive Redirection Skills and Children’s Prosocial Skills

Hypothesis 2 proposed that *101s Teacher Interaction Checklist* scores and *Children’s Prosocial Checklist* scores would be correlated. Correlation analyses were used to examine the relationship between assessment outcomes between *The 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist* dimensions of positive redirection of behavior and outcomes on *The 101s Children’s Prosocial Skills Checklist*. Table 15 indicates the impact of *The 101s* teacher positive redirection techniques of Make a Big Deal,
Incompatible Alternative, Talk Positively to Others and Extinction Principle on children’s self control, compliance, emotional regulation, and attention.

Table 15

Correlations Table of Teacher Positive Redirection and Child Prosocial Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>selfctrpost</th>
<th>cmplncepost</th>
<th>emregpost</th>
<th>attntpost</th>
<th>mbigdea post</th>
<th>iapost</th>
<th>talkpospost</th>
<th>extinctpost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>selfctrpost</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cmplncepost</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.919**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emregpost</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.916**</td>
<td>.888**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attntpost</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.881**</td>
<td>.936**</td>
<td>.853**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mbigdea post</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.815**</td>
<td>.808**</td>
<td>.795**</td>
<td>.608**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iapost</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.730**</td>
<td>.777**</td>
<td>.800**</td>
<td>.764**</td>
<td>.897**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talkpospost</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.767**</td>
<td>.779**</td>
<td>.752**</td>
<td>.765**</td>
<td>.645**</td>
<td>.518**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extinctpost</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.595**</td>
<td>.513**</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>.640**</td>
<td>.563**</td>
<td>.652**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The 101s Child Prosocial Skill Checklist scores for the dimensions of helping, asking, sharing, and cooperation also showed significant positive correlations with The 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist for the dimensions of positive redirection skills.

Table 16 indicates the correlation statistics for the positive redirection of behavior techniques. For The 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist dimension of positive redirection
skills, Make a Big Deal, Incompatible Alternative, Talk Positively About Others, and Extinction Principles were highly positively correlated with children's self-control, compliance, emotional regulation, attention, helping, asking, sharing, and cooperation (See Table 15.

Table 16
Correlations Table of Teacher Positive Redirection and Child Prosocial Skills 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>mkbigdeapost</th>
<th>lapost</th>
<th>talkpospost</th>
<th>extinctpost</th>
<th>helppost</th>
<th>askpost</th>
<th>sharepost</th>
<th>cooperpost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlations</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mkbigdeapost</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lapost</td>
<td>.897**</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.818**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.688**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talkpospost</td>
<td>.640**</td>
<td>.698**</td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>.654**</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.779**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extinctpost</td>
<td>.663**</td>
<td>.659**</td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.746**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helppost</td>
<td>.496**</td>
<td>.542**</td>
<td>.542**</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>askpost</td>
<td>.698**</td>
<td>.714**</td>
<td>.714**</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.918**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharepost</td>
<td>.610**</td>
<td>.747**</td>
<td>.747**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.927**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperpost</td>
<td>.714**</td>
<td>.742**</td>
<td>.742**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.772**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
• Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In summary, teacher scores for positive redirection skills were highly correlated with children's prosocial scores. Teachers in the experimental group who received The
The 101s training had children with higher prosocial checklist scores compared to teachers in the control group who did not receive The 101s training, thus confirming hypothesis 2.

**Relationship between Teacher Responsive Social-Emotional Support and Children's Prosocial Skills**

Correlation analyses were also used to examine the relationship between responsive social-emotional support and outcomes on The 101s Child Prosocial Skills Checklist. Table 17 indicates the correlation between The 101s teacher responsive interaction techniques of Validation, Get on the Child’s Eye Level, Time In, and Modeling Principles on children’s self control, compliance, emotional regulation, and attention.

Table 17

*Correlations Table of Teacher Responsive Social-Emotional Support and Child Prosocial Skills*
### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>validpost</th>
<th>eyelpost</th>
<th>timeinpost</th>
<th>modepost</th>
<th>emregpost</th>
<th>selfctrpost</th>
<th>attntpost</th>
<th>cmplncepost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>validpost</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>eyelpost</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>.680**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>timeinpost</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>.720**</td>
<td>.923**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>modepost</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>.757**</td>
<td>.851**</td>
<td>.688**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>emregpost</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>.727**</td>
<td>.726**</td>
<td>.785**</td>
<td>.582**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>selfctrpost</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>.729**</td>
<td>.808**</td>
<td>.843**</td>
<td>.689**</td>
<td>.916**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>attntpost</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>.693**</td>
<td>.863**</td>
<td>.869**</td>
<td>.691**</td>
<td>.653**</td>
<td>.861**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cmplncepost</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>.648**</td>
<td>.827**</td>
<td>.976**</td>
<td>.670**</td>
<td>.888**</td>
<td>.919**</td>
<td>.936**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

---

For the dimension of responsive social-emotional support, Validation Principle, Get on the Child’s Eye Level Principle, Time In Principle, and Modeling Principle were highly positively correlated with self control, compliance, self regulation, and attention. The highest correlations were identified between Validation Principle and the prosocial skills of self-control

(r = .73, p < .01), and emotional regulation (r = .73, p < .01); between Get on the Child’s Eye Level and the prosocial skills of self control (r = .81, p < .01), compliance (r = .83, p < .01), attention (r = .88, p < .01), and cooperation (r = .82, p < .01); and between Time in Principle and the prosocial skills of self control (r = .84, p < .01), compliance (r = .87, p < .01), emotional regulation (r = .78, p < .01), attention (r = .87, p < .01), and cooperation (r = .85, p < .01).
Similarly, *The 101s Child Prosocial Skill Checklist* scores for the dimensions of helping, asking, sharing, and cooperation showed significant positive correlations with the dimensions of teacher responsive social emotional support. Table 18 indicates the correlation statistics for Validation, Get on the Child's Eye Level, Time In, and Modeling Principles to helping, asking, sharing, and cooperation. The highest correlation was identified between Talk Positively About Others and children's prosocial skill of sharing ($r = .85, p < .01$). A high correlation also was identified between Get On the Child's Eye Level and cooperation ($r = .82, p < .01$). Similar results were identified between Time In Principle and helping ($r = .84, p < .01$), and cooperating ($r = .85, p < .01$).

In summary, these results confirm hypothesis 2, that *The 101s Teacher Interaction Skill Checklist* had a high correlation with the *Children's Prosocial Skills Checklist*. Overall, teacher positive redirection scores and responsive social-emotional support scores were highly correlated with children's prosocial skills scores. Teachers in the experimental group who received *The 101s* training had children with higher prosocial checklist scores than teachers in the control group who did not receive *The 101s* training.

Table 18

*Correlations Table of Teacher Responsive Social Emotional Support and Child Prosocial Skills 2*
Relationship between 101s Training and Teacher Attitudes

In order to evaluate barriers to the use of positive redirection of behavior skills and responsive social and emotional support, hypothesis 3 proposed that training in The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline would impact teachers’ attitudes toward strategy support for children’s behavior. Preliminary results from qualitative data taken from document reviews and questionnaires have identified several trends that impact teacher use of positive teacher redirection skills and responsive social-emotional support in the pre-K classroom.

Much insightful information emerged from the participant questionnaires that explained reasons for teacher beliefs and practices, as well as hesitation to change...
interaction approaches. It was interesting to note that many teachers mentioned parental resistance to positive discipline and others suggested that their own cultural and social beliefs influenced their acceptance of a more punitive school environment. Teachers indicated that a primary barrier to trying new ways to engage children included fatigue and personal frustration. Some cited the “quick fix” provided by punitive methods, and felt positive methods could require excessive time to support. Some commented that, “positive approaches took a long time” to learn. Other time-related barriers included, “large work loads with testing, pressure, data, portfolios and planning.” Another suggested, “Teachers are too busy ‘putting out fires’ all over and have to get through all those SOLs.” “Learning new approaches takes time.” Teachers also mentioned that district requirements for literacy, academic skills and testing competed for their time and attention.

One teacher reported that she overheard a parent telling a child, “Behave in school, or I’ll beat you at home.” Another teacher reported that a parent said, “All he understands is yelling.” One suggested, “Some children do not respond positively to these techniques because of their home environment.” One explained it this way: “When a child is constantly yelled at and punished at home, other methods at school may have no effect.” Several teachers in the training felt that, “Positive approaches won’t work with their population of children.”

Teachers reported that beliefs about compliance and control were hard to change. “Children should respect their elders.” “Do what you are told to do.” “Children should follow directions.” Some teachers indicated that punishment often brought about fast relief from misbehavior. “Teachers are looking for order any way they can get it.” One
explained, "Teachers are more interested in controlling their students so that they can teach." "Now he is still. That is all he understands is yelling." In spite of these attitudes, some felt they were kinder today because they remember being treated negatively themselves when they were children.

Other emotional-cognitive factors that were barriers to positive approaches included emotional frustration and inconsistency. "If a student repeatedly does the inappropriate behavior, it's hard not to get upset and react." Teachers also mentioned difficulty setting boundaries or expectations. "Some teachers look foolish, because they threaten, threaten, threaten, and never follow through." "Teachers are very aware of how they come across. They are frustrated and angry at themselves when they show anger, because they are unsure of how to handle the situation more positively." "No, I don't think adults are aware of how they come across to children. Anger is an all-consuming emotion." "They have too many pressures and distractions to concern themselves with children's feelings." One teacher summed it up this way, "I do not believe they [teachers] see the students' real feelings." Another said, "Pay attention to how children feel? No, their [teacher] anger is usually related to frustration, and emotions are stronger than rational thought at the time." This lack of awareness was given as a primary reason why teachers do not see the impact of anger or punitive practices on children.

Religious beliefs were frequently given as a reason why teachers use punishment or punitive methods. "Spare the rod, spoil the child – or he will make a fool out of his parents." Other beliefs included that "children need harsh discipline," or "yelling is good to get a child's attention." Many felt religious factors caused other teachers to hesitate to
change. "Home has a major influence, even when people don’t want to be like their parents. Their parents were their main or only role models."

Resistance to change itself was cited as a reason that teachers might hesitate to incorporate responsive practices. Many teachers felt that more experienced teachers might not be willing to change their approaches. "Most teachers know effective ways to discipline, but we just choose not to use them." Some said that knowing they needed to complete the reflective homework assignments helped them follow through on what they knew was best for their children.

In summary, teachers felt their practices were impacted by stress, beliefs about compliance and control, ideas about punishment, emotional frustration and inconsistency, religious beliefs, and resistance to change. More negative comments were given concerning overall frustration with ongoing discipline issues. However, when teachers saw their own students respond positively after the training, they were encouraged to continue. "I feel these techniques make a difference, because the more the teacher becomes comfortable using them, the more they see positive results." One said, "The parents have commented back on the positive behavior! I can tell this really helps."

While cultural and emotional-cognitive factors were expressed as potential barriers to change, teachers reported that the successful implementation of the techniques in their classroom gave them confidence. One said the training helped teachers think about their actions and focus on new ways to get the results they wanted. The qualitative data provide support for hypothesis 3, that training in *The 101s* will impact teachers’ attitudes about responsive and positive practices in preschool classrooms when they are given effective strategies to
use to replace other methods, and when they are given a chance to reflect on the cultural, emotional, and experiential reasons they choose their current discipline practices.
Discussion

With the development of state standards and quality rating improvement systems for preschool classrooms, the need for research-based training to support and increase classroom quality and child outcomes has taken on urgent significance. There is a need to determine which types of training will improve teacher interaction practices, to determine how to deliver this training in a way that meets the practical realities of classrooms and childcare settings, and that makes sense to preschool teachers' understanding and experiences. In order to serve increased numbers of children and link the well-established benefits of responsive, positive classrooms to improvement in teacher practice, the current study is particularly relevant. While researchers can clearly articulate the kinds of interactions children most need to develop social skills and achieve their highest potential, there remains a gap in translation of this research into practice.

Interaction approaches must be communicated to teachers in ways that translate concepts into practical skills that are useful to teachers who interact daily with children. There must be a fundamental understanding of skills needed as well as a willingness for teachers to want to apply the new skills in complex preschool environments and social-learning situations. With 62% to 70% of childcare providers holding only a high school diploma, it is imperative that teacher training be relevant to the daily challenges experienced by teachers. *The 101s*, with a background of use for over 35 years at the university level in a teacher education licensure and training program, provides a bridge between research and practice.

Research, professional, and policy mandates are given to educators to create respectful and positive preschool environments. Therefore, it is essential to provide
teacher training and mentoring support that can be shown to increase the quality of
teacher interactions. With the Quality Rating Improvement Systems (QRIS) in
development, providing research-based evidence for specific training that will increase
scores on required measures of quality would be desirable for securing short- and long-
term benefits. The results of qualitative and quantitative data from the current study
provide promising results that support the effectiveness and practicality of The 101s
training model implementation.

Impact of The 101s Training on Classroom Interaction Quality

The 101s training model implementation showed statistically significant results and introduced important practical considerations for application in quality improvement to preschool classrooms. Evaluation of data from The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline training model confirmed the hypothesis that the experimental group teachers who received The 101s training had significantly higher 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist scores and CLASS dimension scores than the control group who did not receive The 101s training. On The 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist, for dimensions of positive redirection of behavior skills and responsive social-emotional support, teachers who attended The 101s training had significantly higher scores than control group participants who did not attend training.

In addition, for teachers who received The 101s training, CLASS observation scores for positive climate, teacher sensitivity, regard for student perspectives, and for behavior management dimensions, were significantly higher than the control group teachers who did not receive training. The current study confirmed the efficacy of The 101s training in increasing the overall quality of teacher-child interactions in preschool
classrooms. These results provided promising data that support the use of The 101s training as part of the QRIS mentoring component that is currently being developed, and substantiated the efficacy of The 101s model for teacher training in positive classroom discipline approaches.

Teachers who received training were more likely to use positive redirection through incompatible alternatives, constructive choices, and positive reinforcement of desired behaviors, all of which are recommended as optimal approaches to establish self-regulated prosocial behaviors. Further, The 101s trained teachers were more likely to report positive contributions demonstrated by the children. By reducing the number of negative comments and focusing instead on desired behaviors, teachers reduced the attention given to undesired behaviors. Several important results were seen.

First, teachers who received The 101s training were more likely to ignore age-appropriate wiggling type behaviors (Extinction Principle), which are frequently addressed by teachers during instruction or transition times. Instead, teachers were more likely to redirect children’s attention toward the desired behavior and learning opportunity. Some examples of minor behaviors were shoe-tying, foot-wiggling, or other behaviors that were not embarrassing, dangerous, destructive, or an impediment to learning, and which were developmentally appropriate for young children. Previously, these behaviors served to irritate many teachers and distract them from a focus on uninterrupted enriched learning, creative play, or relational interactions. A more positive, responsive approach was established as teachers ignored minor issues, and focused instead on positive reinforcement of desired behaviors.
In addition, *The 101s* trained teachers were more likely to talk about students' accomplishments and positive behaviors to parents, other teachers, and students (Talk Positively About Them to Others Principle). Teachers began to pay more attention to behaviors that were desired and to reinforce them when they occurred (Make a Big Deal Principle). In these ways, overall positive climate was increased.

The high correlation between the use of *The 101s* techniques and higher quality outcomes may be grounded in positive reinforcement and relational theory. While the study does not explain the specific nature of the correlation, several elements are important to consider. First, it is well established that children's behavior is likely to increase when positively reinforced, and is only temporarily suppressed when punished. Since the goal of preschool teachers is to establish and support prosocial behaviors that serve as the foundation of school success, the use of proactive and intentional strategies that positively reinforce rather than punish is essential. The literature review also documented the fact that children may be more likely to respond cooperatively to models that are responsive and provide positive choices. A teacher's interaction and a child's response are strongly influenced by the quality and nature of the relationship.

Previous studies provide evidence that young children need and are responsive to warm, respectful connections with their caretakers. It is well established that the adult functions as a role model for empathy, trust, and "relatedness" skills. These reciprocal interactions in turn cause the child to develop lasting perspectives about himself and others. The need for a positive relationship of a child with the caregiver provides a formative context where the child desires to "belong" and to function successfully within the social community of the classroom. In the current study, teacher interactions that
increased as a result of training included positive behavior supports and reciprocal, responsive social-emotional interactions. These relational improvements, which can be statistically linked to the training model, established higher prosocial skill functioning and positive behavior outcomes for the children.

Higher teacher interaction quality scores may be accounted for by the fact that the principles from *The 101s* themselves act as incompatible alternatives for the negative or punitive teacher approaches that were replaced. Since higher scores on the CLASS included a descriptive quality rating based on positive climate, regard for children’s perspective, and responsive social-emotional support, it stands to reason that by replacing punitive interactions with the principles from *The 101s* (by their descriptive definition) interaction scores of quality would likely increase.

For example, Talk Positively About Others is an incompatible alternative to yelling or focusing on negative aspects of children’s behavior. Thus the substituted positive strategy would in itself change the overall quality of teacher interaction. Similarly, Get on a Child’s Eye Level is an incompatible alternative to a teacher’s lack of focus or lack of intentionality in connecting with a child. Likewise, instead of dismissing a child who is upset, using the Validation Principle would call for a teacher to implement verbal description of the child’s feelings, thus causing the teacher to act in a more attentive way to the child. Make a Big Deal requires that the teacher proactively look for, focus on, and reinforce positive behaviors before misbehavior occurs. That these new skills are incompatible alternatives to non-responsive or punitive behaviors is logical. When the teacher changes her own behaviors, the child’s response is likely to change as
well. This explanation is well founded based on previous studies that suggest that children's cooperative responses are dependent on an adult's preceding or precipitating interaction.

The skills required for positive redirection of behavior and responsive social-emotional support correlated highly to increased positive climate, sensitivity, regard for student perspectives, and behavior management. One possible explanation is that as the teacher shifts her focus from reactive strategies, to a more intentional observation of children's positive behaviors and then implements strategies to support prosocial skills, her overall responsiveness, sensitivity, and regard for student perspectives (by their definition) also increase. This shift from reactive to proactive strategies is an important component of the established measure of classroom quality as defined by the CLASS assessment.

A third consideration is that when teachers are trained to use The 101s principles, the process of implementation requires intentional evaluation about desired outcomes and selection of strategies that would most likely support those results. Since CLASS dimensions of behavior management take into consideration intentional facilitation and scaffolding of prosocial skill development, the identification of desired goals is critical. When implementing The 101s strategies, the teacher must develop awareness of the ways her own actions facilitate or impede the desired goals.

For the dimension of responsive social-emotional support, The 101s training introduced specific skills for validation and modeling with strategies that all teachers, regardless of their understanding of child development, could implement. This element is of considerable importance, so that limitations in a teacher's previous experience or
training will not preclude a teacher's ability to effectively implement the strategies. For example, in using the Validation Principle, a teacher might respond to a child, "I am sorry you feel sad. I would never do that to you. Thank you for telling me." This verbiage may be easily implemented by teachers, and is not dependent on advanced training in psychology or counseling. Provision of effective language and modeling of the use of interaction skills both during training and in subsequent DVD models made these skills easily understandable and applicable to real-life contexts.

One example of the successful application of The 101s skills was the use of Get On The Child's Eye Level Principle, which like the other The 101s strategies, was correlated with increased CLASS scores. Teachers who received The 101s training were more likely to use this strategy and therefore gave more intentional eye contact by joining a child and providing individual focus. With the addition of a specific strategy to create more frequent dyadic teacher-child interactions within a primarily group oriented environment, teacher responsiveness and resulting interaction quality increased.

The quality of teacher responsiveness within dyadic interactions has potentially significant impact on outcomes for children at risk who are least likely to have extended conversation supported or reciprocal interaction facilitated by their teachers (Good, 1987). While the overall classroom climate (as rated by CLASS) may be in the high range, one or two incidences noted during any given observation may well have been observed between the teacher and the child at risk of school failure. Thus, even though a higher overall rating of quality is given, it may miss or not address the deficits potentially encountered by the child most in need of responsive support.
It is important to note that the qualitative data of the current research study revealed teacher attitudes that suggest that children who most need the responsive support are the ones least likely to receive it. For these children, a current lack of prosocial skill development may become a precipitating factor for ongoing negative interactions with their teacher. Rather than take the opportunity to connect and to provide respectful support in order to ensure children’s success in developing the missing skills, the teacher may be more likely to respond with punitive measures. Thus, children at risk will not develop perceptions of themselves as competent and successful, and will continue to miss out on opportunities to gain the very skills they lack.

If our goal is to intervene and provide mediation to children at risk, it is imperative to raise this discussion and focus future research specifically on the children who spend inordinate amounts of time in punitive restriction (time outs) away from instructional formats, and who are most likely to bear the focus of negative interactions with teachers. Further study to examine teacher responses to children who lack prosocial skills, both in the context of dyadic as well as group interactions, will be an important focus for future research.

The use of preparation, repetition and practice (rehearsal) of strategies for both learning and behavior are particularly critical for preschool children who are developing self-regulation as they are just gaining the prosocial skills to interact effectively with peers and adults (Godfrey, Crisham-Brown, Schuster, & Hemmeter, 2003; Pintrich & DeGroot, 1990; Stipek, 1997). Approaching instruction and teacher-child interactions in a proactive, intentional manner to support these skills, rather than reacting negatively after a child demonstrates the lack of appropriate skills is a key necessity. The use of The
101s principles provides reliable strategies for teachers to use that will support preparation, allow for repetition in a supportive atmosphere, and facilitate creative rehearsal of positive prosocial skills. The more that specific prosocial skills are supported, the less teachers will need to attend to behavior issues.

Teacher energy invested in building children's social-emotional competence is critical. Most behavior programs focus primarily on the correction of behavior problems after they occur. The 101s, on the contrary, focus on the prevention of behavior problems. Preschoolers are dependent on adults to teach and support the successful development of prosocial skills. For a child to be punished when he cannot exhibit positive behavior, when those behaviors have not been adequately, specifically, and respectfully taught, is a disservice to the child and is likely to disrupt his/her feeling that school is a positive place to be (Blair, & Peters, 2007; Noble, 2005).

The fact that specific skills can be learned by teachers in a relatively short training time and readily implemented for higher quality results has practical implications. Giving teachers specific approaches that can be taught in 90 minutes, and that are easily implemented, matters significantly to a state with 5780 licensed centers where 62% of teachers and 70% of home providers hold only a high school diploma. While the important contribution of early childhood research cannot be understated, without the ability to translate the research into practice to underpaid and under-supported caregivers who interact with children on a daily basis, the gap between research and practice will remain.

If our goal is to raise overall childcare and teaching quality, the positive correlation between training in The 101s and higher scores on the CLASS is noteworthy,
as it confirms the hypothesis that training in *The 101s* will increase CLASS scores, a validated measure of overall classroom quality. Since the CLASS assessment is being used as the primary measure of quality for teacher-child interactions in the state QRIS system, it is critical to underscore the need for practicality of the techniques and ease of implementation. *As The 101s* training does not require an expensive investment or extensive education level to implement, it provides a unique benefit to those responsible for large-scale training.

The use of specific *101s* principles revealed statistically significant differences in teacher interactions with children before and after training. Those trained in *The 101s* techniques were more likely to use the strategies and skills consistently across observations, and to receive higher CLASS scores and checklist scores than those without training. These results confirm the effectiveness of *The 101s* training in establishing positive redirection of behavior approaches and greater responsiveness in teacher-child interactions and in raising overall classroom quality. Importantly, increases in *The 101s* *Teacher Interaction Checklist* scores were highly correlated with increases in CLASS scores.

The need for teacher strategies to establish prosocial behaviors in preschool calls for formative assessments that are designed to evaluate the development of these behaviors. For this purpose, assessments must be simple, easy to use, not require excessive time to complete, and focus on proactive, intentional teacher skills that build and support as well as assess outcomes. Keeley, Smith & Buskist (2006) suggest that the use of positive checklists provides “behavioral anchors” (pg. 84) which create a useful focus on building strength-based outcomes. Moving away from a deficit oriented model
(Nickerson, 2007) will emphasize teacher strategies to build children's competencies, and enable teachers to gain the type of interaction skills that will impact children's social and learning outcomes.

*The 101s* checklists provide a link between training skills and classroom implementation as they focus on the establishment of strength-based behaviors. The use of simple checklists that allows teachers to see the results of their strategies in daily interaction makes practical sense as a means of linking research to practice in the context of the bathroom, playground, naptime and transitions, as much as within the context of instructional environments. The purpose of the current study is to isolate specific teacher strategies that will increase children's prosocial functioning. The validation of a checklist that supports teacher use of skills from *The 101s* and also supports CLASS score increases provides a useful tool in teacher training.

Because *The 101s* was developed within the context of teacher training in childcare and public early childhood classrooms, the application of the research-based skills and techniques in the model makes it practical for teachers who work with children within authentic relational interactions. When a child has a bloody lip from a playground incident, an irate parent has just left, two 4 year old boys are scuffling over an upturned easel, and the lunch bell is scheduled to ring in three minutes, a teacher must be able to prioritize her reactions while remaining calm and support of children's prosocial functioning. The techniques from *The 101s* are shown to increase positive, responsive teacher interactions within the context of the complex challenges of real-life preschool classrooms, and also provide a useful companion checklist readily available for daily use.

*Impact of The 101s Training on Prosocial Skills*
For research question two, it was hypothesized that *The 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist* scores and *Children's Prosocial Checklist* scores would be correlated, and that children in the experimental group whose teachers attended *The 101s* training would have higher prosocial skill scores than children in the control group whose teachers did not attend *The 101s* training. The results of the study indicated that the use of *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* positive interaction techniques (positive redirection of behavior and responsive social-emotional support) highly impacted measures of children's prosocial outcomes. These findings were particularly striking, as training did not include psychological evaluation of children or a discussion about "how or why" children behave in particular ways. Instead of focusing on behavior after it occurred, the strategies gave teachers effective ways to establish and support the development of prosocial behaviors.

Overall, training in *The 101s* techniques increased outcomes for children's prosocial behaviors. For teachers who used positive redirection of behavior and responsive social-emotional strategies, each strategy highly correlated to greater prosocial responding. All eight prosocial skill dimensions, including emotional regulation, self-control, attention, compliance, helping, asking, sharing, and cooperation, were related to teacher use of *The 101s* principles (See Figure 5). Children with teachers who used the principles from *The 101s* training were more likely to show higher levels of prosocial skills, with the greatest increase in emotional regulation, compliance, help and cooperation.
### The 101s Principle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Self-Control</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Emotional Regulation</th>
<th>Attention</th>
<th>Helping</th>
<th>Asking</th>
<th>Sharing</th>
<th>Cooperation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make a Big Deal</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompatible Alternative/Choice</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk Positively to Others</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinction</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get on Child’s Eye Level</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-In</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5: Impact of The 101s on Children’s Prosocial Skill Functioning**

Before training, many teachers were observed who reinforced behaviors they actually were trying to discourage. For example, when teachers stopped instruction to focus on children who were off task, rather than focus on children who were actively engaged, the children not participating received the attention, and therefore, quality instruction and conversation were interrupted. An example was the child who turned a cartwheel on the playground while in line, and was promptly invited by the teacher to lead the line back into the building. A pay-off for this behavior was quickly established. Conversely, when the Make A Big Deal Principle was implemented by teachers in the training group, they were more likely to give attention to the children who were behaving appropriately, thus creating an environment that created a “pay off” for participation and involvement, as well as engagement and cooperation.
Teachers in the training group were more likely to use the Incompatible Alternative/Choice Principle. In those classrooms, the teacher decided what the child needed to do, and then gave him the suggestion for successfully accomplishing the task. For example, instead of telling a child to stop playing, the teacher would ask the child to come and help pass out papers. She might give him a choice of two ways to change his behavior into a productive use of his time. Instead of telling the child to stop running, she might suggest “tiptoe like a turtle, or walk on marshmallow feet.” The behavior was modeled, and the choices provided were both acceptable to the teacher. These approaches allowed the child autonomy in decision-making and eliminated the power struggles teachers had reported as accompanying demands for obedience. As importantly, the incompatible alternative was more likely to yield compliance.

After training, teachers were less likely to issue ultimatums and threats. For example, instead of saying, “Give that toy to her now, or you can go sit in the corner,” she might offer the choice of sharing the toy in one minute or two. If the child responded by saying she wanted three minutes, the teacher simply repeated the original incompatible alternative/choice, “One minute or two. You choose or I’ll choose.” This teacher interaction skill continued to place responsibility and rehearsal of prosocial skill choices with the child, while allowing the teacher to enforce individual responsibility. Another advantage of this approach was the redirection of teacher focus away from misbehavior and towards consideration of desired positive outcomes.

During the training session, teachers admitted they expected children to know right from wrong or to be able to choose how to behave appropriately. Teachers were encouraged to practice rehearsing strategies with the children, and support successful
outcomes, thereby shifting the focus from obedience and resistance to cooperation and successful problem solving. The strategies gave alternatives to replace punitive demands and threats. The new skills maximized the opportunity to focus the child’s attention on decision-making and cooperation without the use of yelling, shame, embarrassment or confrontation. Post-test data showed that the use of positive redirection skills correlated with higher scores on the teacher interaction checklist as well as correlation with higher CLASS scores.

These results have significant implications for preschool teachers of children at risk. When teachers have effective tools for redirection of behavior, they are able to spend more time engaging in non-controlling conversations, thus facilitating learning and prosocial skill support. As a child’s prosocial responding increases, the teacher may come, as the literature suggests, to perceive the child as more cooperative and responsible, further increasing likelihood of more frequent positive teacher interactions. In addition, when teachers experience their own competence using positive behavior redirection skills, they may be more likely to engage students in extended conversations and to facilitate reciprocal interactions, thus enhancing more advanced verbal skills.

The significant results of the current study revealed connections between teachers’ responsive social-emotional support and children’s prosocial responding. Since relational issues of respect, bonding, and mutual regard are critical for young children prior to kindergarten, it is important to see that as teachers change their behaviors, the impact can be seen in the resulting responses of children. As seen in Figure 5, responsive interactions for Validation, Get on the Child’s Eye Level, Time In, and Modeling Principles also increased children’s prosocial responding.
Without the need for complicated explanations for children’s behavior, measurements of frequency of misbehavior, or focus on the negative aspects of adjustment problems after they occur, the 101s training provided strategies to replace punitive approaches. The correlation data and resulting higher prosocial scores found in classrooms of teachers trained in *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* add important information to the discussion about effective teacher training programs. Since prosocial skills are known to increase both short and long term academic achievement and school adjustment outcomes, the current study provides new evidence about the connection between changes in teacher behavior and resulting higher outcomes for overall classroom interaction quality and resulting prosocial outcomes for children. *The 101s* training model focuses on supporting changes in teacher behaviors, which directly impact the overall relational and classroom climate of the preschool classroom. While the specific reasons have not been isolated, the current study supports the contention that when teachers change their behavior, children respond by changing theirs.

It is important to note that high levels of teacher-directed control may preclude children from having the opportunity to practice prosocial skills. In researcher qualitative data, it was noted that often children were not allowed to interact during meals. In some classrooms, all talking was discouraged. In high control classrooms, children did not have the opportunity to hear strategies about or to practice prosocial skills. However, in *The 101s* teacher trained rooms, self-control strategies were facilitated through the use of the Choice Principle or Incompatible Alternative Principle, where teachers “talked through” options for success, such that children both learned and practiced useful strategies for themselves. The Modeling Principle and the Make a Big Deal Principle
were intentional strategies used by the intervention group teachers to facilitate prosocial
skill development. These results suggest that training in effective redirection skills may
be useful to help decrease the use of high levels of teacher control, which would allow
more opportunities for prosocial skill practice for children.

Impact of 101s Training on Teacher Attitude

For research question 3, training in *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline*
provided opportunity for teachers to reflect on their attitudes about strategy support for
children’s behaviors. Teachers commented on potential barriers they perceived to using
positive, responsive approaches. These included their own, as well as administrator and
parent’s beliefs about appropriate expectations of control, compliance and obedience. It
was found that in spite of what is presented in public policy forums and educational
guidelines about the need for positive approaches and responsive interactions, existing
attitudes might prohibit teacher implementation of positive and recommended
approaches. Nevertheless, teachers trained in *The 101s*, expressed willingness to
implement the specific principles in their classroom. After training and implementation,
they commented on their own satisfaction with the use of the principles, as well as their
ability to see the impact in child behavior outcomes.

Hypothesis three suggested that barriers of culture, value, attitudes about
discipline and previous experiences may contribute to teachers’ choices of interaction.
The current research, by focusing on changing teacher interaction approaches through the
use of specific alternative strategies, was successful in impacting the overall quality of
interactions. Further, when teachers implemented the training principles, they admitted
that their views of the child changed as they observed children’s more cooperative and
enthusiastic responses. Teacher use of the skills and strategies of The 101s impacted their belief that children could be cooperative when non-punitive approaches were used.

Practical Challenges and Implications

Classrooms with higher 101s Teacher Interaction Checklist scores were characterized by strong personal relationships. Teachers trained in The 101s used effective positive redirection of behavior skills, provided responsive social-emotional support, and allowed for choice and incompatible alternatives while scaffolding learning and behavior with prompts, cues, and questions. These teachers ignored minor misbehavior, and talked supportively about the children's prosocial skills. They were more likely to validate children's feelings, and use reassuring words and physical proximity during interactions. The interactions were characterized by calm, responsive support, with clearly developed expectations, personal regard and respect.

Teachers who attended training spent a greater amount of time on the children's eye level and created more intentional interactions. Strengths included responsive relational interactions and consistent personal connections. Teachers were more likely to greet children at the door with personal conversation and to provide encouragement for purposeful learning activities upon entering. Interactions were characterized with warm, supportive relational connections that were emphasized in The 101s training.

A hallmark of higher quality classrooms was the responsibility given to children. Higher rated rooms gave more responsibility to each child for their belongings, behavior, learning and play choices. For example, children helped lay out naptime mats, pass out materials, and were encouraged to help their peers with problem solving challenges, or to accompany them to the bathroom or to get a drink. These responsibilities were
interwoven through the day, and not simply confined to “clean up” time. There was higher level of intentional prosocial skill support, and notably higher positive peer interaction.

In rooms with lower scores where teachers were not trained in The 101s, there was more inconsistency across task environments. For example, some teachers were excellent at maintaining cooperation within the context of a well-planned lesson, yet were characterized by negative or more punitive approaches when children were in transition, walking down the hall, or in the bathroom. The most common techniques of punishment included removal of a child from instructional time, time outs, and children being excluded from instruction areas. Other punitive measures included the taking away of privileges, recess, resource times, library, music, or a special event. One class of 4 year olds misbehaved and had Easter egg hunting completely removed from them on a holiday. The principal was called in, and the children cried. While teachers may have rated high on teacher interactions primarily in the context of instruction, the child’s overall experience was categorized as much by his or her experiences at lunch, snack or recess, and was influenced by a teacher’s ability to support peer-related prosocial skills.

Excessively coercive physical control was sometimes seen in rooms with lower scores. For example, children might be asked to put their heads down and keep “bubbles” in their mouths during instructional time. Some teachers made children walk in the hall with their hands in artificial positions, or lay on their nap cots in very prescribed or rigid ways (on their backs, for example, and not allowed to roll over, or conversely, on their stomachs). Given the strong evidence in the research literature for the remedial effect of responsive, positive support, it is important to discuss the impact of
high levels of punitive or restrictive control on children at risk who most need responsive support to develop prosocial skills.

In some classrooms, there was an evident lack of prosocial skill facilitation, such as rehearsal, modeling, practice, and role-play. Even in the training group, due to the high level of teacher control and primarily teacher directed activities, very little time was given where children had opportunity to practice prosocial skills. In many observations, children were not allowed to talk at lunch, or were seated at meals with an empty seat between them, thus not effectively facilitating opportunity for positive social interactions.

When teacher shamed or embarrassed children, they were in turn, more likely to have lower prosocial scores and more likely to engage in relational peer retaliation. For example, when a child whose hair was pulled from behind, turned around to face the aggressor, she was made to sit alone during lunch for disobeying the teacher’s request to face forward in line. Children often cried after a fight or an aggressive incident, with inconsistent teacher intervention.

These examples are provided to highlight the very complicated and challenging aspects of teacher training as well as to shed light on the realities of daily life in the preschool classroom environment. It is important to highlight that inconsistency was found within schools, with highly rated teachers next door to teachers with lower interaction scores, suggesting that overall school climate may not be responsible for classroom quality, but rather the individual training and experiences of teachers. Never the less, for all teachers who were trained using The 101s model, classroom quality increased. Increases in responsive interactions and positive redirection of behaviors
resulted in higher prosocial skills by children in both adult-child and peer-to-peer responding.

An important issue not addressed in this study was the presence of assistants in the classroom. Because the assistants were not allowed to participate in training, observations were conducted when primary teachers were “in charge.” However, it is critical that future research focus on the role of assistants on classroom quality. The level of skill of classroom aides or assistants has significant influence on the overall quality of classrooms and children’s experiences. It was observed that some teachers restricted their primary responsibility to teaching, and left behavior management issues to the aide. Further, the discrepancy in discipline styles between the aide and teacher (controlling, vs. supportive; harsh vs. lenient; positive vs. negative; yelling vs. not yelling) often presented children with differing rules and consequences across environments.

For example, when a teacher had led a positive and responsive lesson, the children might be sent to lunch with the aide, who was punitive or harsh in her actions. When the children would return to the room after the meal, they exhibited anxious questioning and displayed externalizing behaviors of peer aggression. One teacher commented, “I don’t know what’s wrong with them. They had such a good morning.” When the aide used negative approaches as a primary means of control, the children were seen to display higher levels of aggression, even when the teacher’s approaches were characterized as positive. The inconsistency of approach due to shared responsibility by aides and teachers is an important consideration for future research.

Suggestions for Future Research
For future study, it will be important to increase the size of the sample population, and investigate the impact of longer or repeated training. The current study was limited by the time constraints of the semester and the long hours it required to complete observations. It is recommended that this study be expanded and funding sought to increase the size and strength of its impact.

Further, training for principals, school counselors, and specialists who would be able facilitate school wide awareness about the need for responsive, positive practice would increase understanding of the need for teacher training and the benefits to children of responsive practices. School leadership would be able to support discussions about the need for and resistance to change. Involving school leadership in training would provide an important foundation for application of research to practice as well as sustained quality improvement.

Next, it would be important to study the impact of providing parent support materials with *The 101s* training program. Weekly newsletters or bulletins that included techniques or principles from *The 101s* would help parents understand the need for positive social-emotional and behavior supports. As the qualitative data suggested that parents might be resistant to positive approaches for behavior redirection, a joint involvement would be encouraged. These efforts would potentially increase consistency and long-term support of positive, responsive parent-child as well as teacher-child interactions.

**Conclusion**

The results of this study show that the training model of *The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline* offered a practical solution to connecting research to practice. The
findings of the current study yielded promising, significant results in teacher reported experiences as well as statistical data that demonstrated increases in overall classroom quality as a result of *The 101s* training. The use of *The 101s* and *The 101s Checklists* in the QRIS and other mentoring programs would be an effective means of increasing classroom quality and responsive caregiver/teacher-child interactions. *The 101s* training model would facilitate skills for children at risk, and impact the quality and nature of their daily school experiences.

With thousands of schools, centers and homecare providers that serve children at risk, not all will choose to be part of a voluntary state improvement system. *The 101s* training model provides a uniquely suited and inexpensive means of providing professional training as part of quality mentoring systems and other professional training programs, and is equally accessible to individual teachers and centers who do not participate in formal quality improvement systems. Since the goal is to improve overall interaction quality, the use of *The 101s* will significantly increase responsive interactions and positive redirection approaches, thus substantially improving the educational and social environments for thousands of children.

As states face issues of scale, sustainability, and accountability, the use of *The 101s* will address some of the most critical challenges that are present due to the cost and administration of expensive mentoring and assessment systems. *The 101s* training model provides a research based practical solution that is easily transferable to the real-life challenges of caregivers and teachers that can be distributed to centers at minimal cost. The use of a simple, easy to follow guide and video makes this training model a practical tool for thousands of centers, schools, and homecare providers. In addition, the use of
The 101s Checklists as formative tools for self-assessment is an equally important benefit. The reflective and practical approach of the training manual provides caregivers and teachers with a strength-based system that focuses on behavioral anchors and desired goals. All of these practical applications make The 101s highly effective in delivering needed training and mentoring.

The 101s training model of the current study bridged the gap in research by translating concepts about teacher-child interactions into specific strategies that easily can be implemented in the classroom. Teachers reported that The 101s training provided them with effective tools and strategies that enhanced their relational interactions and facilitated changes in their own interaction behaviors, which resulted in positive changes in children's behaviors. The study provided evidence that when teachers focus on providing positive redirection of behavior and responsive social-emotional support, children respond with greater cooperation, self-regulation, and overall prosocial skill development. The 101s provide an important link between research and practice that is critical for young children, if the contribution of early childhood research is to be actualized in consistent, responsive, sensitive caregiver-child interactions and higher quality environments.

Children are dependent on adults to support and empower them with the skills needed to navigate their social worlds and become confident in their ability to create healthy relational interactions. A child who is prepared emotionally and socially will be ready to learn, and ready for school when he arrives at kindergarten. Early literacy and enriched language environments are non-negotiable, but the research is clear that these
elements must be grounded in a foundational environment of responsive, respectful interactions and warm, sensitive relationships.

There must be an intentional effort made by educators, parents, caregivers, and policy makers to bring these challenging issues to the discussion table, and to place the mandate for the relational, social-emotional needs of very young children at the forefront of conversation. It will not be enough to talk about early literacy, quality environments, or "access and accountability" unless everyone involved can talk honestly about the reality of the daily lives of children at risk.

This research has highlighted some of the challenges children will face as they move from preschool into elementary school and forward in their lives. In the preschool classroom, children will have a chance to gain the skills they need to gain equal and empowered access to healthy, satisfying lives. This can happen when children have early, trustworthy, consistent, reliable, caring, responsive, and respectful relationships with the adults who care for them. It is through these authentic, growth-fostering relationships that children will develop a sense of themselves as worthy of love and respect. Through these relational interactions, they will come to value themselves and feel successful so that they will be willing to work hard and overcome obstacles in order to achieve. They will in turn, be able to create for themselves and others, the same healthy interactions that have been modeled to them.

The unique need to sustain both group and dyadic interactions in a complex environment of preschoolers requires a distinctive set of skills. These essentials need to be taught. The 101s training model provides these needed skills for responsive relationships. These strategies for respect, connection, and modeling can assist teachers
and parents in learning effective ways to redirect behavior that support healthy decision-making, and empower choice and autonomy. Children must gain skills to navigate their social world, and to know that they can create positive outcomes for themselves and others. The teachers who participated in this study communicated that gaining the skills to redirect behavior in positive ways and to connect successfully with children, changed their feelings about their own competence, and gave them a renewed vision of the influence they could be in children’s lives.

While this study focused on children in an urban school district, the community and nation are filled with three and four year olds whose early preschool experiences will contribute to lifelong patterns for future relationships and for academic and life endeavors. The 101s can help bridge the gap between the overwhelming research evidence that supports this study, and the realities and challenges of the preschool classroom. The 101s training model is an effective tool that will connect research to practice in mentoring and training programs, and will make a significant difference in improving the quality of care for children who will spend hundreds of hours at the most formative time in their lives in preschool environments.
“If you don’t know what was done to you, you will find out when you become parent or a teacher. It is counterintuitive to focus on the behaviors we want to see more of. Children repeat the behaviors that work to get our attention, and they repeat the behaviors that they see us model.

Children learn by watching the significant adults in their lives. When we look in one room, children are rolling all over, and we might think the behavior problem is the children. But in the next room, children are with a different teacher and are right on task. What is the difference?

The difference is the teacher.”

Dr. Katharine Kersey, August 2008 – Head Start Training for 380 Preschool Teachers
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Appendix A

Informed Consent Agreement

Old Dominion University
Early Childhood Educational Research
February 2008

As leaders in early childhood education, Old Dominion University and Public Schools, have partnered to conduct important educational research, designed to improve professional development for early childhood educators. As part of a scientific, scholarly research study, we need your help in participation and feedback, to design relevant, future professional development for early childhood teachers.

The educational study is designed to learn more about the behaviors of pre-K students—what will motivate them to cooperate, listen, get along with others, and develop what early childhood educators call “pro-social skills.”

As part of the study, you may be selected to participate in the 90-minute training in April or next fall, as part of the regularly scheduled professional development. Half of pre-K teachers will receive the training in the spring, and the other half will receive it later—so that all receive benefit. The goal is to evaluate the training and materials. Your feedback and participation are very important in the process.

The study will start in a few weeks—with Marie Masterson, doctoral candidate at ODU, visiting pre-K classrooms to collect baseline information on the ways that pre-K students respond to interactions with teachers and peers. Marie will not interfere with the teacher (you), the children, or any classroom activities. Following research-based protocol established by UVA and the state of Virginia for the program, she will watch the pre-K students, regardless of the activities (lunch, centers, or outside play, etc.), for four 20-minute segments. She will visit again before the end of the school year.

All findings from the study will be aggregated, and no teacher, individual or school will be identified. Your participation will improve the design of relevant, professional development for early childhood teachers in the future.

If you would like to support early childhood educational research and participate, you do not have to respond. However, if you do not want to receive the early childhood professional development and participate in the study, please sign and return the opt-out form below, to no later than Friday, February 29.

Katharine Kersey, Ed.D. Director of Child Study Center
ODU Graduate Program Director - Early Childhood Education
Marie Masterson, Doctoral Candidate

Opt-Out Form: Early Childhood Educational Research 2008
I do not want to receive the early childhood professional development and participate in the study:
First and Last Name_________________________School_________________________
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The 101s: A Guide To Positive Discipline Training Manual

The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline

What you give to a child when he is with you
Can change the rest of his life.

Katharine Kersey, Ed.D.
Marie Masterson, MS.Ed.
Old Dominion University
Child Study Center
Norfolk, VA, 23529-0136
Research shows that preschool children need responsive social emotional support, positive redirection of behavior, and intentional prosocial skill strategy guidance from teachers. The principles in this training manual illustrate specific techniques that create the kinds of teacher child interactions that give children necessary skills to be successful in social and academic learning – both now and in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Positive Redirection Responsive Social Emotional Support</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrate Respect Principle</td>
<td>Positive Redirection Responsive Social Emotional Support</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Modeling Principal</td>
<td>Positive Redirection Responsive Social Emotional Support</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Incompatible Alternative and Choice Principles</td>
<td>Positive Redirection</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Extinction Principle</td>
<td>Positive Redirection</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Validation Principle</td>
<td>Responsive Social Emotional Support</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When I show respect, children become respectful.

When I am kind, children become caring.

When I speak softly, children become listeners.

When I love to learn, children become life-long learners.

Children are always watching,
Children Learn By Watching Us

When a child is developing, he takes all of his cues about himself from the adults in his life. He discovers his sense of himself as a human being through the way adults respond to him, and in the way they speak to him and to others. When adults are kind – children feel they are worthy of kindness.

What children do is what you do - and what they say is what you say. Unless we think about it and make it conscious, most of us will do what was done to us when we were children. Our responses will come from what we experienced. Sometimes, we will do the opposite. If we were raised in a strict environment, we may react to that by becoming permissive. If you have children of your own, you know that you “become like” the way you were raised. You might be surprised to hear the words come out of your mouth that someone said to you.

We need to be conscious of how we respond to children – and then choose to speak and act on purpose. We want to become conscious of our responses – so that we can help children learn the skills they need to be successful in school and life. What children learn from watching us will determine how they will respond to others in the future.
The Goal of Discipline

Discipline means to teach and train. The goal of discipline is self-discipline. We want children to learn the skills they need to navigate through life on their own. The sooner they have skills for getting along with others, the better. Children are capable of developing those skills early.

Many people confuse the word “discipline” with the word, “punishment.” Unfortunately most people use those words synonymously. We often hear, “What this child most needs is a little discipline.” What is meant by that is, “This child needs a little punishment.”

Punishment is to inflict pain on purpose. There are a lot of ways we inflict pain on others. Sometimes it is conscious, but other times it is unconscious. There are a lot of other ways besides hitting that we hurt others.

Can you think of some ways?
Helping Children Develop and Make Good Decisions

You can hurt children emotionally if you are yelling, insulting, name-calling, being sarcastic or embarrassing them. If someone embarrassed you by calling attention to what you were wearing, and made you feel silly, what would you feel like doing? You might feel like leaving, retaliating, or embarrassing that person back. You might want to hit her, or tell on her. Or you might turn your anger inward and cry.

Whenever someone humiliates you, talks down to you, or embarrasses you, it sets up a negative reaction in you. You probably want to turn around and go the other way, or retaliate in some way. The connection is broken whenever we are hard or angry with another person. It makes them shrink up instead of open up. What we want children to do is to stay open to us. Then they will want to follow our guidance and become like us.

We want to help children develop self-discipline, so that they can make their own good decisions, without being dependent on the external control of others.

By gaining simple skills that will help YOU, you will also be giving children the skills they need to grow, learn, and develop into healthy adults.
What is Discipline?

We want to shift our thinking about what discipline means. Our goal is to stay connected to children so that they want to “come along with us,” learn with us, and stay connected to us. We want to teach children skills to redirect their own behavior and gain confidence that they can negotiate life’s challenges.

We want children to be able to make good decisions and take responsibility for their own actions. They need a safe environment to trust us – where they can feel confident to take risks and learn from their mistakes. We want to focus on teaching children healthy ways to get along and solve challenges with results that are satisfying and successful.
### Discipline and Punishment: What’s the Difference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Punishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline means to teach and train</td>
<td>Punishment means to inflict purposeful pain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline teaches children that responsibility comes from self.</td>
<td>Punishment makes a child dependent on external control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline increases long-term positive behaviors.</td>
<td>Punishment decreases motivation and effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline teaches permanent skills.</td>
<td>Punishment only stops behaviors temporarily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline strengthens the bonds of connection between adult and child.</td>
<td>Punishment breaks the connection and causes a child to retreat or pull away from an adult emotionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline teaches emotional competence and self-regulation.</td>
<td>Punishment that embarrasses the child will make him turn his anger outward by acting out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline gives children skills to be successful in school.</td>
<td>Punishment makes a child feel school is not a pleasant place for him to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline shows children that they can be a success.</td>
<td>Punishment makes children feel like a failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline makes children resilient, empathetic, and caring toward others. The child turns these feelings outward.</td>
<td>Punishment causes self-doubt, shame and embarrassment. The child turns these feelings inward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline creates responsibility and significance that turns into cooperation</td>
<td>Punishment causes retaliation and anger that turns into uncooperative behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline inspires a child to be like YOU.</td>
<td>Punishment will make a child act like YOU.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline

1. Connect Before You Correct Principle –

Find ways to "connect" with a child - get to know him and show him that you care about him - before you begin to try to correct his behavior. This works well with parents too. Share positive thoughts with them about their child before you have problems that need to be addressed.

There are simple ways to connect, that will make children want to be like you and cooperate with you.

- **TIME IN PRINCIPLE** - Start each day by standing by the door. Greet every child by name, smile, and tell them you are glad they came.

- Give a compliment: “Hi Tanisha! How did things go with your brother? He is so lucky to have you as his sister.”

- Help each child feel special to you. “It makes me glad to have you in my classroom. Your smile makes the day happy for me.” “I am so glad you are here.”

- **GET ON THE CHILD’S EYE LEVEL PRINCIPLE**: When talking with the child, get down on his/her eye level and look him in the eye while talking softly to him/her.

What are three ways you can connect with children in your classroom? How do you think this will make a difference in the way children respond to you later?
2. Demonstrate Respect –

Treat the child the same way you treat other important people in your life - the way you want him to treat you - and others. (How would I want her to say that to me?)

- Practice saying “Please come here” three different ways. Which way would make the child WANT to come to you?

- Imagine there is a video camera focused on you. At the end of the day, how will you feel watching yourself? This is how children see you.

- Be your BEST self. More than anything else, this will make children want to be THEIR best selves.

Name one thing you want to change about the way you come across:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Children are less likely to seriously misbehave when they sense a deep love and respect on the part of the one who matters to them.

What you do is as important as what you say.
3. Modeling Principle –

Model the behavior you want. Show the child, by example, how to behave. Children are watching us – all the time – and they will grow up to be like us – whether we want them to or not.

- If you want children to be polite, then you can say, “please, thank you, and excuse me” in a pleasant voice when you ask for something or take something from a child.

- Remember the Golden Rule? Ask yourself, “How would I want someone doing or saying that to me?” “How would that make me feel?”

- Treat children as you would other special and important people in your life.

Make a list of THREE qualities you would like to see in your students.

How will you model those each day?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
4. Make a Big Deal Principle –

Make a big deal over responsible, considerate, appropriate behavior - with attention (your eyeballs), thanks, praise, thumbs-up, recognition, hugs, special privileges, incentives (not food).

- Give attention to the children when they ARE doing what you want them to do as often as possible, and let them know how proud you are of their good choices. Use positive, specific feedback. Tell them what they are doing that you want to see more of!

- Let children see that doing the RIGHT thing PAYS OFF – in recognition, privileges, praise, and value in your classroom community.

- Tell each child - frequently - "You have a good head on your shoulders. You decide. I trust your judgment." This brings out the best in the child and shows him/her that eventually he will be in charge of his own life and responsible for his/her own decisions.

Often, when a child is reading quietly, we tend to focus on other children, or use the time to get work done. THAT moment is when we need to make a big deal – so that the child will want to do MORE of it!

- Take a clipboard with you and give a child a check for doing the RIGHT thing when walking quietly in the hall.

- Draw a smiley face on the board and let children sign their name for making good choices.

- Send home GREAT MOMENTS or other certificates every day and CATCH the children being kind helpers, hard workers, and good friends.
5. Incompatible Alternative / Choice Principle

Instead of spending energy focusing on what is not working, you need to think about and give attention to, what you **what we want to see happen**. The behaviors you look at and talk about – grow, so be sure to be alert to the behavior you WANT, instead of to the behavior you don't want. (When you give more attention to tantrums, the child has more tantrums!)

By positively redirecting behavior, it draws the child’s attention to constructive solutions. As you provide purposeful, meaningful ways for the child to be successful, he will learn how to make positive choices for himself in the future. That is our goal – to help children learn to make good choices on their own.

The following principles help you accomplish the **results you want** – quickly.  

**5a. Incompatible Alternative –**

Give the child something to do that is incompatible with the inappropriate behavior. Say, “Let’s pretend we are on a secret mission and see if we can walk all the way to the cafeteria without anyone hearing us.” "Help me pick out 6 markers" (when the child is unfocused or annoying). If a child is bothering you by playing his calculator, instead of berating him, simply ask him to help you by sorting the papers or crayons by color.

When you use the **Incompatible Alternative Principle**, give the child something constructive to do instead of what he is doing. “Let’s stack the blocks two by two.” An incompatible alternative is something that he **can’t do** at the same time as the thing you don’t want him to do.

**5b. Choice Principle –**

Give the child two choices, both of which are positive and acceptable to you. "Would you rather tiptoe or hop over to the carpet?" “We need to clear off our desks. Do you need one minute or two?” Then set the timer.

Instead of saying, ‘Stop running,” say, “Would you rather sneak or tiptoe?” This takes the focus off of running, and you have given the child a choice of two positive alternatives.

“Would you rather walk on clouds or pillows?” “Let’s do it together.”
**Children Will Quickly Make a Choice.**

Children will feel more in control of what is happening to them and more willing to be cooperative when we support their need to feel competent.

It is important to use only two choices, and for both choices to create a positive outcome for the child and be acceptable for you.

If the child refuses, or decides on a third choice not provided by you, simply say, "You choose, or I'll choose."

For example, when you say, "It's time to clean up. Would you rather do it in one minute or two?" - There may be a child who will say, "I want three." Then, you say, "One minute or two. You choose, or I'll choose." Ninety nine percent of the time, he will choose. The child will want to choose for himself, and so will make the decision to go with one of the choices you have provided. He wants and needs to have some control over his life.

A child is climbing on a chair. What are two alternatives that you could give that would help the child do something different?

Can you think of an example of an Incompatible Alternative?

Can you think of an example of the Choice Principle? Remember, both choices need to be acceptable to you - and provide POSITIVE outcomes for the child.
6. Extinction Principle –

Ignore minor misbehavior that is not dangerous, destructive, embarrassing or an impediment to learning. (Look the other way. Play deaf.)

Remember, children want our attention.

Children repeat the behaviors that work and eliminate the ones that don’t work. Teachers often don’t realize how much attention they give to behaviors they would prefer to eliminate!

Our natural instinct is to be drawn to disruptive, self-defeating, unproductive behaviors, because those are the ones that distract us. Unfortunately, by giving the behavior our attention, we inadvertently reinforce it!

When teachers stop teaching and focus on these minor behaviors, teaching time is lost.

We need to train ourselves to catch children doing the right thing, and as often as possible look away from the negative behavior so that it does not get reinforced and escalate.

Can you think of an example of annoying behaviors that you can ignore?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

If the behavior is dangerous, destructive, embarrassing, or an impediment to learning, our job is to stop it, take action right away, in the least reinforcing way possible. There are many alternatives we can use from the 101s, such as Incompatible Alternative, Take a Break, When-Then/Abuse it-Lose it, Change of Environment, Divide and Conquer, Hand Gestures, or Nip it in the Bud, that allow us to keep our cool, yet help children to be responsible. Remember, whenever possible, we want to give our attention (eyeballs) to desirable behaviors, so that we cause those to be more important, valuable, pay off, and increase.
7. Talk About Them Positively to Others –

Let children overhear you speaking positively about them - bragging about their good qualities, efforts, and actions - to others.

We want children to know how proud we are of the skills they are learning. The more we say GOOD things, the more children want to DO them.

- Refrain from talking about what a child did wrong. Instead, use POSITIVE words to tell others what children did that made you proud. They will beam with pride and do MORE of it!

- When visitors come into the classroom, say, “I want you to meet my wonderful class. I am so proud of them!” When parents come by, say, “Let me tell you something fantastic Josie did today.”

- When parents come in, say at least one positive thing about each child as he or she comes and goes. Soon children will be doing MORE of these behaviors.

Think of a child whose behavior you find annoying. What are some positive statements you can tell others about THIS child?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
8. Validation Principle –

Acknowledge (validate) the child’s wants and feelings. “I know you feel frustrated with your friend and want to keep both books to yourself. I don’t blame you. I would feel the same way. However, she needs to have one. Do you want to choose which one, or shall I?”

“I know you don’t want to stop playing your game. I don’t blame you. I would feel the same way. However, when the bell rings, you need to line up with the other children.”

Children are less likely to act out when they can use their words. We can help by giving them words to describe how they feel, and validate their experience.

When a child is upset, you can say:

“Thank you for telling me.”

“I am sorry that happened.”

“I am sorry you feel sad. I would never do that to you.”

When we model using specific emotional language, children learn how to use their words, instead of to act out their feelings.

What are some emotion words that children can learn to describe their feelings besides feeling “mad?”
9. Whisper Principle – Instead of yelling, screaming or talking in a loud voice, surprise the child by lowering your voice to a whisper. This surprise often evokes immediate attention. It also helps you to stay in control and think more clearly.

- When you feel like yelling, whisper instead. *(You may have to count ten first.)*

- **KEEP YOUR COOL!**

What all children need are teachers who “keep their cool!” When young children flip out, melt down, or fall apart, what they really need is for YOU to stay unflappable! Right at that moment, children need you to step back and think, and STAY CALM. Children need you to be in control – **of yourself!**

A child is going to take his emotional cues from you. So the person whose behavior you need to think about – is your own. If you want children to be calm and respectful – **you need to be calm and respectful!**

When you stay in control of yourself, a child learns how to be in control of himself. Your calm response will show a child how to manage his emotions and to know he is worthy of your respect.

*What makes you feel most like yelling, when you could choose to whisper instead?*
10. Belonging and Significance Principle –

Remember that everyone needs to feel that s/he belongs and is significant. Help your child to feel important by giving him important jobs to do and reminding him that if he doesn't do them, they don't get done! Help him/her feel important by being responsible.

Help children be responsible for their own belongings, and ask them to take responsibility for specific jobs in the classroom.

What are some jobs you can give that will help children feel they can make a significant contribution to the classroom?

One teacher we know has a Feelings Helper. This child’s responsibility is to validate the feelings of students in the classroom by taking a tissue to a child who is crying or sad. The Time Keeper is responsible for starting and stopping the timers throughout the day. The Book Helper helps the teacher pass out books and helps hold the Big Books. The Door Holder is always second in line. The Disk Jockey is responsible for the music in the room. The Germ Buster is responsible for squirting soap or hand sanitizer (or passing out towels) before lunch or when needed. There are many creative ways to name jobs. Make sure that every child has a special job to do each day.
Creating the Outcomes You Want

We must be convinced that a change in our own behavior will pay off by a change in the way children respond.

It is easier to say, “That child needs to change his behavior,” than to admit that the person whose behavior needs to change is our own. It’s hard to put the camera on ourselves and see how our own responses caused or created a reaction or negative response in the child rather than helping him respond positively.

When an adult sets up a power struggle, the child “puts up his back.” The teacher’s challenge to the child often sets up his resistance to us – even when there was none before the interaction.

When the teacher invites a child to be in control of his own choices – the child will respond by cooperating. This makes the day go more easily for everyone!

Then we will spend less time dealing with behavior issues, and more time accomplishing the real goal – developing respectful children who have a thirst for life long learning.

When we focus on the positive, we create an atmosphere of trust where children are free to explore, create, learn and discover while staying connected to those around them.

Supporting positive strategies with responsive, respectful interactions will -

- give children skills to be successful in school
- increase cooperation
- create higher achievement
- ensure healthy relationships
- empower self-discipline and self-direction
HELPING CHILDREN BE SUCCESSFUL

We want to put ourselves in the place of the child. When a child is frustrated, it's our job to help her find a way to meet that need in a way that is satisfying to her, yet teaches her successful ways to negotiate her world. We need to decide what it is we DO want her to do – and then to provide her with several ways she can choose to do it. We want to help children make healthy choices, starting small when they are young, and gradually turning over the responsibility of their lives to them.

Often we expect children to read our minds to know how to do things they have never been taught. Although our expectations may be clear to us, our children may not have a clue. Don't forget to take time to teach what you want children to do. Become the person you want your students to be, be patient to teach them what you expect, and model the behaviors and skills you want them to have. Let them see how happy you are when they are cooperative, kind and helpful.

As you try the principles for the first time, you will see how simple these techniques are to use. The change you feel in yourself and see in your children will definitely be worth the effort. You will quickly notice a difference in how your children respond to you. You will feel calm, rewarded, and confident – with energy at the end of the day – and proud of your children as others notice how well behaved they have become. You will be making a difference every day by changing their life – and your own.
1. Review the workbook daily.

2. Add (use) two new principles each day. By the end of the first week, you will have used all of them, and will be thinking of ways TO use the strategies every day.

3. Keep a record of how you used two principles each day, and how each situation turned out.

Three sets of principles are provided for your use – one set for each week. (Feel free to photocopy more.) Return them in the envelope at the end of each week.

4. Keep track of your efforts using the checklists.

5. Please keep your experience and these materials confidential from others in your school who may not be participating in training at this time. This confidentiality is important to the research evaluation of the training protocol.

By remaining calm and respectful as we support positive discipline outcomes, we will be changing the lives of children – and our own!
THE TOP TEN 101’s from: The 101’s A Guide To Positive Discipline
Author: Dr. Katharine C. Kersey Ed.D.

1a. Connect Before You Correct Principle - Find ways to "connect" with a child - get to know him and show him that you care about him - before you begin to try to correct his behavior. This works well with parents too. Share positive thoughts with them about their child before you have problems that need to be discussed.

1b. Get on the Child's Eye Level Principle - When talking with the child, get down on his/her eye level and look him in the eye while talking softly to him/her.

1c. Time In Principle - Start each day by standing by the door. Greet every child by name, smile, and tell them you are glad they came.

2. Demonstrate Respect Principle - Treat the child the same way you treat other important people in your life - the way you want him to treat you - and others. How would I want someone doing or saying that to me? "I would not want someone saying that to me, therefore I will not say it."

2b. Whisper Principle - Instead of yelling, screaming or talking in a loud voice, surprise the child by lowering your voice to a whisper. This surprise often evokes immediate attention. It also helps you to stay in control and think more clearly. (When you feel like yelling - whisper instead!)

3. Modeling Principle - Model the behavior you want. Show the child, by example, how to behave. Children are watching us - all the time - and they will grow up to be like us - whether we want them to or not.

4. The Make a Big Deal Principle - Make a big deal over responsible, considerate, appropriate behavior - with attention (your eyeballs), thanks, praise, thumbs-up, recognition, hugs, special privileges, incentives (not food).

5a. Incompatible Alternative - Incompatible Alternative Principle - Give the child something to do that is incompatible with the inappropriate behavior. "Let's pretend we are on a secret mission and see if we can walk all the way to the cafeteria without anyone hearing us." "Help me pick out 6 markers" (instead of running around the room). If a child is annoying you by playing his calculator, instead of berating him, simply ask him to help you by putting away the blocks.

5b. Choice Principle - Give the child two choices, both of which are positive and acceptable to you. "Would you rather tiptoe or hop over to the carpet?" "You choose or I'll choose." "We need to clear off our desks. Do you need one minute or two?" Then set the timer. (This can be used with spouses. "The garage needs to be cleaned out. Would you rather do it tonight or Saturday?")

6. Extinction Principle - Ignore minor misbehavior that is not dangerous, destructive, embarrassing or an impediment to learning. (Look the other way. Play deaf.)

7. Talk About Them Positively to Others Principle - Let them overhear you speaking positively about them - bragging about their good qualities and actions - to others.

8. Validation Principle - Acknowledge (validate) the child's wants and feelings. "I know you feel frustrated with your friend and want to keep both books to yourself. I don't blame you. I would feel the same way. However, she needs to have one. Do you want to choose which one, or shall I?" ("I am sorry that happened to you. I know you feel sad. I would never do that to you.")

9. Whisper Principle - Instead of yelling, screaming or talking in a loud voice, surprise the child by lowering your voice to a whisper. This surprise often evokes immediate attention. It also helps you to stay in control and think more clearly. (When you feel like yelling - whisper instead!)

10. Belonging and Significance Principle - Remember that everyone needs to feel that s/he belongs and is significant. Help your child to feel important by giving him important jobs to do and reminding him that if he doesn't do them, they don't get done! Help him/her feel important by being responsible.
1. **Connect Before You Correct Principle** - Find ways to "connect" with a child - get to know him and show him that you care about him - before you begin to try to correct his behavior. This works well with parents too. Share positive thoughts with them about their child before you have problems that need to be discussed.

How I used this principle:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

How it turned out:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

2. **Demonstrate Respect Principle** - Treat the child the same way you treat other important people in your life - the way you want him to treat you - and others. How would I want someone doing or saying that to me? "I would not want someone saying that to me, therefore I will not say it."

How I used this principle:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

How it turned out:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Remember: When talking with a child, get down on his/her eye level and look him in the eye while talking softly to him/her. Greet children personally at the door.
3. **Modeling Principle** - Model the behavior you want. Show the child, by example, how to behave. Children are watching us – all the time – and they will grow up to be like us – whether we want them to or not.

How I used this principle:

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

How it turned out:

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

4. **The Make a Big Deal Principle** – Make a big deal over responsible, considerate, appropriate behavior - with attention (your eyeballs), thanks, praise, thumbs-up, recognition, hugs, special privileges, incentives (not food).

How I used this principle:

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

How it turned out:

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________
5a. Incompatible Alternative - Incompatible Alternative Principle - Give the child something to do that is incompatible with the inappropriate behavior. "Let's pretend we are on a secret mission and see if we can walk all the way to the cafeteria without anyone hearing us." "Help me pick out 6 markers" (instead of running around the room). If a child is annoying you by playing his calculator, instead of berating him, simply ask him to help you by putting away the blocks.

How I used this principle:

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

How it turned out:

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

5b. Choice Principle - Give the child two choices, both of which are positive and acceptable to you. "Would you rather tiptoe or hop over to the carpet?" "You choose or I'll choose." "We need to clear off our desks. Do you need one minute or two?" Then set the timer. (This can be used with spouses. "The garage needs to be cleaned out. Would you rather do it tonight or Saturday?")

How I used this principle:

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

How it turned out:

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________
6. Extinction Principle - Ignore minor misbehavior that is not dangerous, destructive, embarrassing or an impediment to learning. (Look the other way. Play deaf.)

How I used this principle:

How it turned out:

7. Talk About Them Positively to Others Principle - Let them overhear you speaking positively about them - bragging about their good qualities and actions - to others.

How I used this principle:

How it turned out:
8. Validation Principle - Acknowledge (validate) the child’s wants and feelings. "I know you feel frustrated with your friend and want to keep both books to yourself. I don't blame you. I would feel the same way. However, she needs to have one. Do you want to choose which one, or shall I?"

("I am sorry that happened to you. I know you feel sad. I would never do that to you.")

How I used this principle:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

How it turned out:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

9. Whisper Principle - Instead of yelling, screaming or talking in a loud voice, surprise the child by lowering your voice to a whisper. This surprise often evokes immediate attention. It also helps you to stay in control and think more clearly. (When you feel like yelling – whisper instead!)

How I used this principle:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

How it turned out:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
10. Belonging and Significance Principle - Remember that everyone needs to feel that s/he belongs and is significant. Help your child to feel important by giving him important jobs to do and reminding him that if he doesn't do them, they don't get done! Help him/her feel important by being responsible.

How I used this principle:

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

How it turned out:

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
**TEACHER Interaction Checklist**

**Positive Redirection and Responsive Emotional Support**

Tally (or have someone keep track) during two 20 minute time period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Connect</th>
<th>Time One (20 minutes)</th>
<th>Time Two (20 minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrate Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Make A Big Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Incompatible Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Extinction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Talk About Them Positively To Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Validation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Whisper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Belonging and Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Child Prosocial Behavior Checklist

Below are the skills children need for school success. Make A BIG DEAL every time you see them. Talk positively about at least one of these traits every day. Tally for 20 minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Time One</th>
<th>Time Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolves conflict appropriately, inhibits reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperates with adult direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps willingly when asked for assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empathy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps or comforts others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sharing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares possession with another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Self-Regulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds appropriately (gets help, speaks respectfully) when provoked (toy taken, pushed, spoken to rudely, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows physical demonstration of affection towards others when not under distress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks for help appropriately when needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacts cooperatively with peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attentiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to attend and follow along with group activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SIMPLE TIPS YIELD BIG PAY OFFS

Smile!

Look for – and praise the positive!

Call out children’s names when they are doing what you WANT them to be doing.

Don’t wait for perfection! Focus on supporting children’s success along the way as they learn and grow.

Have FUN. Let children know how much you enjoy them!

SIMPLE TIPS FOR THINGS TO AVOID

- Asking children why.

   They don’t know why. Instead, use the Incompatible Alternative Principle and quickly redirect children’s behavior.

- Telling a child what he did wrong in front of other children.

   It only makes them embarrassed, and breaks the connection. Instead, focus on what should be done the next time by using the Choice Principle.

- Giving long explanations. (Children tune you out.)

   Use the Demonstrate Respect Principle and talk to children as you would want someone to talk to you.

- Creating Power Struggles.

   Be careful not to say, “If...then...” The child may choose to do nothing. Instead, use the When/Then, Abuse it/Lose It Principle. “When you have finished cleaning up the paints, then you may play with puzzles. If the child hesitates, simply repeat the “When/Then” calmly. If a child breaks a rule or mistreats something, he loses the privilege. He can come back when he is ready.

- Making children apologize.

   It makes them lie about their feelings. Instead, quietly apologize for the child. “I am sorry that happened to you. I would never do that to you.” Children will follow your example and will soon apologize for themselves.
WHY CHILDREN NEED
A POSITIVE RELATIONSHIP WITH YOU

More than anything else, children need positive relationships and healthy role models. What you do every day in the classroom is shaping lives of children. You make a difference to the future of children in your care.

Seventy percent of children 3-5 spend over 40 hours a week in childcare – so the hours in preschool take on tremendous importance in healthy child development.

The first five years of a child’s life – are critical for children. Positive, responsive care of a caring teacher mediates even home risk factors, and creates long term school success. (50 percent of high school failure can be attributed to the prosocial skills lacking in the first 5 years of life.)

Prosocial skills include sharing, listening, paying attention, empathy towards others, helping, asking for help, joining a group, getting along and emotional self-regulation. These are SUCCESS skills for school and life.

A consistent, responsive relationship with a caregiver creates a long lasting imprint on the child’s life. A child who is cared for in a consistent, caring way feels worthy of caring for himself, and later seeks healthy relationships with others.
THE RESEARCH BENEFIT OF POSITIVE DISCIPLINE

The 101s: A Guide to Positive Discipline provides a research-based approach to classroom interactions based on authentic, respectful relationships, and strategies that provide children with the prosocial skills needed to support optimal school success.

The principles and strategies from The 101s give teachers research based strategies and practices that provide the following benefits to children:

1. PROTECT FROM EARLY STRESS

   In classrooms where teachers demonstrate high levels of positive regard, are calm and consistent, and have low levels of stress, children are shown to be more positive and demonstrate higher levels of prosocial skills and empathy toward others (Denham & Grout, 1992, 1993; Denham et. al, 1991, Denham, Renwick-DeBardi, & Hewes, 1994).

2. SUPPORT PROSOCIAL SKILLS

   Responsive social emotional support in the classroom from teachers has been shown to support prosocial skill development, increase cooperation and compliance, and mediate against all other factors and allow children at risk to achieve as much as children with no risk factors (Burchinal, Campbell, Bryant, Wasik, & Ramey, 1997).

3. SUPPORT SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL COMPETENCE

   The more a child could correctly identify and verbalize emotional understanding, the less likely he was to demonstrate behavior problems (Ackerman, & Youngstrom, 2001; Raikes & Thompson, 2006).

   Children were more willing to help, to listen, and to respond positively when they had been supported with choices and empathetic interaction, and had received positive prior interaction (Parpal & Maccoby, 1985).
4. FOCUS ON TEACHER-CHILD INTERACTIONS

_Sensitive, reciprocal interaction_ was linked to more positive social and cognitive outcomes (Steelman, 2005) higher empathy and prosocial responding, and emotional self-regulation (Eisenberg, Zhou, Spinrad, Valiente, Fabes, & Liew, 2005).

Children with risk factors (low social economic or minority status) who receive strong _instructional and emotional support_ from teachers achieved academic outcomes equal to students with no risk factors (Hamre, B., & Pianta, R., 2005).

5. DEVELOP STRONG RELATIONSHIPS

A _warm, caring relationship_ supported the development of self-control (Ahnert, Pinquart, & Lamb, 2006; Kestenbaum, Farber, & Sroufe, 1989).

A _secure attachment_ with caregivers is "the most important protective factor in a child’s ability to remain competent and confident, despite a number of risk factors“ (Sroufe, 1992; Smith & Werner, 1992).


6. CREATE A POSITIVE CLASSROOM CLIMATE

Confirming the perspective that social interaction with adults impacts outcomes, are results that indicate that exposure to _positive classroom climates_ and sensitive teachers is linked to greater self-regulation among elementary and middle school students (Skinner, Zimmer-Gembeck, & Connell, 1998).

_Positive classroom climate_ is linked to greater teacher rated social competence and decreases in parent reported problems (Burchinal et al., 2005; Howes, 2000, Pianta et al., 2002).

Theories of motivation suggest that students who experience sensitive, responsive, and _positive interactions_ with teachers perceive them as more supportive and are more motivated within the academic contexts of schooling (Connell & Wellborn, 1991, Deci & RRyan, 1985; Eccles, 1993).
"Positive instructional inputs are associated with more positive and fewer negative interactions between students and teachers and higher levels of attention and task-oriented behavior" (NICHD ECCRN, 2002a; Pianta et al, 2002).

7. PROVIDE SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL SUPPORT

For the 30 percent of children at risk prior to kindergarten, responsive social emotional support in the classroom mediates against all other risk factors and provides for increased development for children in every area. This means that children with risk factors for school failure have EQUAL CHANCE for success in school and life. (Below from - Neurons to Neighborhoods Report from National Research Counsel 88 page summary report: http://www.metrokc.gov/health/reports/neurons-booklet.pdf)

8. USE POSITIVE STRATEGIES FOR CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

1. Connect Before You Correct Principle - Be sure to "connect" with a child - get to know him and show him that you care about him - before you begin to try to correct his behavior. This works well when relating to parents, too. Share positive thoughts with them about their child before you attack the problems!

"Children's self images are formed in large part, according to how acceptable they feel in the eyes of their attachment figures. Children with sensitive, responsive caregivers come to perceive themselves as accepted and valued, whereas children with unresponsive caregivers come to perceive themselves as unacceptable and unworthy of attention" (Cicchetti et al., 1989). Cicchetti, D., Toth, S. I. & Hennessy, K. (1989). Research on the consequences of child maltreatment and its application to educational settings. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 9(2), 33-55.

2. Demonstrate Respect Principle - Treat the child the same way you treat other important people in your life - the way you want him to treat you - and others. (How would I want her to say that to me?)

"This kind of autonomy (providing clear rules and expectations for the child but simultaneously also allowing him or her to experience and express own thoughts and emotions freely, described also in terms of psychological autonomy (Hart et al., 2003)) or feeling of being respected as an individual, has been suggested to be important in the processes of internalizing rules and becoming self-governing" (Grolnick, 2003; Hart et al., 2003). Aunola, K., Nurmi, J.E., (2005). The role of parenting styles in children’s problem behavior. Child Development, 76(6) 1144-1159.

3. Modeling Principle - Model the behavior you want. Show the child, by example, how to behave. Children are watching us - all the time - and they will grow up to be like us - whether we want them to or not.

“When these interactions are characterized by clear and consistently enforced limits, low levels of emotional arousal, ample affection, and a de-emphasis on the use of power, threats, and criticism (Campbell 1997; Herrera and Dunn, 1997; Lepper, 1981; Macoby, 1992; Zahn-Waxler et al., 1979) children learn to observe and ultimately internalize (adult) standards of conduct.” Shonkoff, J.P., (2001). From Neurons to Neighborhoods; The Science of Early Childhood Development. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.

4. Make A Big Deal Principle - Make a big deal over responsible, considerate, appropriate behavior - with attention (your eyeballs), thanks, praise, thumbs-up, recognition, hugs, special privileges, incentives (NOT food).

“When modeled behavior is repeatedly reinforced, and children view it as personally attainable, seeing others reinforced for successful behaviors arouses expectations of similar results in observers. In other words, the model’s continued reinforcement for a behavior also predicts success for the observer. Such behaviors are described as having acquired functional value (Bandura, 1971).” Gredler, M.E., (2005). Learning and Instruction Theory into Practice, pg 352. Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NY.


5. Incompatible Alternative Principle - Give the child something to do that is incompatible with the inappropriate behavior. "Help me pick out 6 oranges" (instead of running around the grocery store). If your husband is annoying you by playing his Gameboy, instead of berating him, simply ask him to help you by drying the dishes.

"Reinforce a behavior that is incompatible with the undesirable behavior. For example, we suppress competitive behavior when we reinforce cooperation (Skinner, 1968). In other words, punishing a student for being out of his seat may be unnecessary if the student has tasks to complete that earn reinforcement (in-seat behavior).” Gredler, M.E., (2005). Learning and Instruction Theory into Practice, pg.127. Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NY.
"One method of helping a child find satisfaction in a behavior opposite that previously performed is to give him a new responsibility that will be rewarding." (Krumboltz and Krumboltz, 1972, pg. 170).

5. Choice Principle - Give the child two choices, both of which are positive and acceptable to you. "Would you rather tiptoe or hop upstairs to bed?" ("You choose or I'll choose.") This can be used with spouses. "The garage needs to be cleaned out. Would you rather do it tonight or Saturday?"

"Nevertheless, results of the current investigation suggest that providing a choice among discrepant reinforcers would be effective because it results in access to a relatively high-preference activity and the opportunity to choose, both of which have independent reinforcing value." Tiger, J.H., Hanley, G.P., & Hernandez, E. (2006). An evaluation of the value of choice with preschool children. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 39, 1-16.

6. Extinction Principle - Ignore minor misbehavior that is not dangerous, destructive, embarrassing or an impediment to learning. (Look the other way. Play deaf.)

Develop clear expectations for student behavior and remove the environmental events that reinforce inappropriate behavior (Gredler, 2005).

7. Talk about Them Positively To Others - Let them overhear you speaking positively about them - bragging about their good qualities and actions - to others.

Self-efficacy is the greatest predictor of academic achievement. "Children who believe in their own abilities and are interested in what they are learning from the curricula are much more likely to do well when they face intellectual challenges." Ahnert, L., Pinquart, M., & Lamb, M.E., (2006). Security of children's relationships with nonparental care providers: a meta-analysis. Child Development 74 (3), 664 -679.

The word gap contributes to the literacy gap – and includes differences in enriched language experiences and words of encouragement received through parent interactions (Hart and Risley, 1995, 1999 NICHD supported research).

50 TIMES MORE - By three years of age, a child from a professional family has heard 500,000 words of encouragement, and a child on welfare less 10,000.

8. Validation Principle - Acknowledge (validate) his wants and feelings. "I know you feel angry with your teacher and want to stay home from school. I don't blame you. The bus will be here in 45 minutes."

"When parents respond to an infant's emotional expressions, help to manage a child's feeling, and assist in labeling and discussing emotional experience, they help the child to understand and organize early emotional experience.

9. Whisper - Instead of yelling, screaming or talking in a loud voice, surprise the child by lowering your voice to a whisper. This surprise often evokes immediate attention. It also helps you to stay in control and think more clearly.

"When these interactions are characterized by clear and consistently enforced limits, low levels of emotional arousal, ample affection, and a de-emphasis on the use of power, threats, and criticism (Campbell 1997; Herrera and Dunn, 1997; Lepper, 1981; Macoby, 1992; Zahn-Waxler et al., 1979) children learn to observe and ultimately internalize their parents' standards of conduct." Shonkoff, J.P., (2001). From Neurons to Neighborhoods; The Science of Early Childhood Development. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.

It takes at least ten positive affirmations to counteract the effects of one negative comment a child hears. It matters what words we use, because words have the power to change the way a child thinks and feels about himself (Bruce Perry, 2005).

10. Belonging and Significance Principle - Remember that everyone needs to feel that s/he belongs and is significant. Help your child to feel important by giving him important jobs to do and reminding him that if he doesn't do them, they don't get done! Help him/her feel important by being responsible.

"Being trusted with a responsibility is in itself highly reinforcing to a child, who up until then has seldom been trusted" (Krumboltz & Krumboltz, 1972).

"Prosocial behavior or helpfulness, is well established by the time a child reaches the preschool years (Murphy, 1937. Fifty years later, these and similar helping behaviors are still quite evident, not only among preschool children, but even among children younger than two (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989, Radke Yarrow & Zahn-Waxler, 1987)" In Lifespan Development, Siefert, Hoffnung, and Hoffnung, 2nd Edition, Houghton Mifflin, 2000.

Taken together, these studies suggest that positive social and instructional experiences within the school setting may help reduce children’s risk, while negative interactions between teachers and children may be particularly problematic for those children displaying the highest risk of school failure." (Hamre & Pianta, 2005. Can instructional and emotional support in the first-grade classroom make a difference for children at risk of school failure? Child Development, 76(5), 949-967).
THE HIDDEN COST OF PUNISHMENT ON ACADEMIC OUTCOMES

1. Punishment does NOT TEACH positive behaviors. (The aim of education is to STRENGTHEN behavior, not suppress it.)

2. Punishment only stops behaviors temporarily - the teacher must resort to it over and over.

3. Punishment causes unwanted emotional by products and escape / avoidance behaviors.
   - The escape behaviors include forgetting, inattention, truancy and vandalism, as well as many more.
   - The emotional side effects include apathy, anxiety, anger, and resentment, all of which stop learning.
   - Punishment leads to physiological changes in anxiety reactions, such as gastric changes, loss of blood from the face, increased blood pressure, and increased cortisol, which can cause long-term health problems and stop the processes of learning.

4. Punishment inadvertently stops (punishes) desirable behaviors such as motivation, effort, class contribution, interest, and empathy. When these positive traits are punished, they decrease as well.

When Children watch other children being punished, there are consequences as well:

5. Punishment decreases a child's self-efficacy (the belief he can do things well.) He will, therefore, give up more easily, instead of persist and show effort in school.

6. Punishment increases frustration. This can lead to withdrawal and resignation, lack of “paying attention” and influences later drug abuse and alcohol use.

7. The misuse of power generates resentment in other students who watch, and undermines respect for the teacher. In fact, when a teacher uses inequitable punishment, children actually release themselves from self-censure of their own behavior, thereby becoming more likely to misbehave, rather than to be compliant.

8. Punishment is an experience of failure. It is experiences of success that cause children to want more success (along with the increase of other motivational behaviors!) We want to give children confidence. Instead punishment breeds self-
condemnation and a higher level of self-judgment, which is more likely to make a child give up.

9. Punishment causes children to become dependent on external control. Once the contingencies are removed, behavior returns to its former strength. (That is why - when a teacher leaves the room, children misbehave.)

10. Punishment causes children to increase in aggressive behavior. In fact, when a teacher uses punishment, children will more likely use aggression as a way of controlling others, including peers.

11. Verbal punishment by a teacher causes increased disruptions from children (including simple reprimands, such as "stop that!")

12. Punishment inadvertently reinforces undesired behaviors. For example, a child running around, or talking loudly in class may crave the attention. By giving attention, even through punishment or even abuse, teachers and parents reinforce - causing MORE OF - the unwanted behavior.

13. Punishment does not cause TRANSFER. That means if I punish a child in my class, the behaviors he is "supposed" to be learning there will NOT transfer to another classroom. This is because the child is not developing INTRINSIC, or self-motivated means of self-regulation.

14. Punishments tends to be reactive and punitive, thus a child does not come to understand the strategies and skills he needs to learn emotional-regulation and self-regulation.

15. Because punishment is an extrinsic reinforcement, it can reduce a child’s desire to spend time on task.

16. Because punishment is completely ineffective as a means of teaching positive, constructive, desired behaviors, the use of it in the classroom (upwards of 90 percent) requires time to be used on classroom management, rather than the real goal of school: LEARNING.


19. Punishment causes children who most need learning support to be physically removed from academically enriching experiences, and to lose out on activities and experiences that would most help them be successful in school (ie through time out, standing out in recess, etc.).

20. Punishment makes children feel that school is not a place they want to be. Early experiences are lasting. One half of graduation failure rate can be attributed to experiences prior to kindergarten. Children at risk are at a 500,000 word gap deficit for the lack of encouragement.
RELATIONSHIPS MATTER TO A CHILD'S FUTURE

For the 30 percent of children at risk prior to kindergarten, responsive social emotional support in the classroom mediates against all other risk factors and provides for increased development for children in every area. This means that children with risk factors for school failure have EQUAL CHANCE for success in school and life. (Below from - Neurons to Neighborhoods Report from National Research Counsel 88 page summary report: http://www.metrokc.gov/health/reports/neurons-booklet.pdf) These include:

- Long lasting improvements in academic achievement
- Higher early and lasting literacy rates
- Increased high school graduation rates
- Employment stability
- Higher IQ
- Greater cognitive development
- Better outcomes for children with disabilities and less referral to special education overall
- Less grade retention
- Healthy relationships with adults and peers
- Increased prosocial skills including emotional and academic self-regulation - the ability to focus attention, to follow directions, and to successfully negotiate social contexts.
- Success in learning and life depend on these skills, gained in the first five years of life!

FIVE REASONS TO FOCUS ON THE POSITIVE WITH CHILDREN

Discipline: To teach and train. The goal of discipline is self-discipline.

1. WORDS MATTER - It takes at least 10 positive interactions to counteract one negative comment a child hears. It matters what words we use because words have power to change the way a child thinks and feels about himself. Words that may not seem important to a parent or teacher may be the defining moment of a child's life.

2. BUILDING CONNECTION IS ESSENTIAL - We want to spend our energy building a positive bond and relationship with the child. By focusing on the positive, we put our energy into connecting with a child instead of spending energy reconnecting. We want to stay connected because connection helps children to respect themselves.

3. RESPECT IS FOUNDATIONAL - When you treat children with respect, it helps them respect themselves. When you form a relationship of trust, you show your child you believe in him, and then he comes to believe in himself. If you respect a child, he will return the favor.

4. CHILDREN REPEAT THE BEHAVIORS THAT WORK - Children repeat the behaviors that work and eliminate the behaviors that don't work. We need to make sure that children get our eyeballs (attention) when they behave appropriately in positive ways!!

5. OUR GOAL IS TO EMPOWER CHILDREN - We want to empower children and convince them that they have the power to make good choices so that they will come to make choices for themselves that will be in their own best interest. We want to give children the skills that teach them how to redirect their own behavior and gain confidence that they can make the right choices.
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Appendix C

The 10Is: A Guide to Positive Discipline Questionnaire

ATTITUDES SURVEY

1. Explain some of the cultural beliefs you have that you feel influence discipline?

2. How much influence do you think your home and upbringing have on the way you feel about discipline? (Why or why not?)

3. Do you think most teachers are conscious of the way they come across when they are angry? (Why or why not?)

4. Do you think most teachers pay attention to see how children feel after teachers get mad at them? (Why or why not?)

5. Do you think you might discipline in different ways you knew parents or others were watching you? (Why or why not?)

6. What is a reason that teachers might have difficulty using the techniques from The 10Is?

7. What would make other teachers want to use the techniques from The 10Is?

8. What is your most difficult discipline challenge?
Appendix D

The 101st  Teacher Interaction Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Positive Redirection Skills)</th>
<th>TIME ONE</th>
<th>TIME TWO</th>
<th>TIME THREE</th>
<th>TIME FOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make a Big Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompatible Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice Principle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk Positively to Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinction/Satiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When/Then</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whisper (Lower)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEACHER CONTROL**

**LEVEL** (1, .75, .50, .25, 0)

(Responsive Social Emotional Support)

| Validate                      |          |          |            |          |
| Connect                       |          |          |            |          |
| Respect                       |          |          |            |          |
| Eye level                     |          |          |            |          |
| Time-In                       |          |          |            |          |
| Modeling - (Role playing, telling story, modeling, or rehearsing) |          |          |            |          |
| Good Head On Your Shoulders   |          |          |            |          |
| Belonging and Significance    |          |          |            |          |
Appendix E

The 101s Child Prosocial Skills Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Usually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-4-5</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MID</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Twenty Minutes</th>
<th>TIME ONE</th>
<th>TIME TWO</th>
<th>TIME THREE</th>
<th>TIME FOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolves conflict appropriately, inhibits reaction (Self-control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperates with adult direction (Compliance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps a peer or adult willingly when asked for assistance (Helping)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps or comforts when not asked (Empathy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares possession with another (Sharing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds appropriately (gets help, speaks respectfully) when provoked (toy taken, pushed, spoken to rudely, etc.) (Emotional Self-Regulation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows physical demonstration of affection towards others when not under distress (Caring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks for help appropriately when needed (Asking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacts cooperatively with peers (Cooperation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to attend and follow along with group activity (Attentiveness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPPORTUNITY FOR PEER INTERACTION (1., .75, .50, .25, 0)

CHANCE TO PRACTICE PROSOCIAL SKILLS